

• OBSERVATIONS ON SIMILES
IN THE
NAIṢADHACARITA

BY
PRATAP BANDYOPADHYAY
*Department of Sanskrit,
University of Burdwan.*

Sa8K
HAR/BAN
48693

SANSKRIT PUSTAK BHANDAR
38, BIDHAN SARANI, CALCUTTA-6
INDIA

No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form by print, photoprint or any other means without written permission from the author and the publisher

© 1966, by the author



First Edition, August, 1966

Price Rs



Published by Sri Shyamapada Bhattacharjee Sanskrit Pustak
Bhandar, 38, Bidhan Sarani, Calcutta-6, India and printed
by Sri D. P. Mitra, at the Elm Press, 63, Beadon
Street Calcutta-6, India

Dedicated
to the departed soul of my revered grandfather
the late
BANKIM BIHARI BANDYOPADHYAY
and
of my revered maternal grandfather
the late
RASIK CHANDRA RAY GHATAK
from whom came to me
the first inspiration in the line of
advancement of learning.

उत्सर्गपत्रम्

विद्यासागरसंक्ते विचरता पारान्तरं ध्यायता

संभूतेन मया न कापि तरणी तावत् समासादिता ।

कालेऽस्मिन् हृदयं प्रयातपुरुषौ तावेव सास्मर्यते

बाल्ये प्रेरणया यतः समभवद् यात्रा भमास्मिन् पथि ॥

वाणीपादसरोजभृङ्गमनसोः क्षेमार्थमस्मान् सदा ।

स्निग्धप्रेरणया प्रयोजितवतो देव्याः समाराधने ।

कालेनापरपारभाषितवतोः संसारपाथोनिधे

न्यस्तोऽयं भवतोः शिवाङ्घ्रि कमले भक्तिप्रसूनाञ्जलिः ॥

नैया ज्ञानप्रकटनकृते जायते मे समीहा

निष्प्रज्ञत्वात् खलु परिभवः प्रापणीयः सुधीभ्यः ।

विद्यासक्ते रपि च भवतोः केवलं तृप्तिहेतोः

शङ्कादोलाविचलमनसा कर्मणीह प्रवर्ते ॥

बोधः स्वल्पो नवमथ वयो दीनता कर्ममार्गे

द्वारे द्वारे न तु भवति मे स्वेष्टसिद्धेय प्रवृत्तिः ।

तस्मादाशी र्यदि भवति वा यातयो देवभूयं

कुन्दभ्रान्तभ्रमरसदृशो नैव विद्वग् भ्रमामि ॥

कालः सर्वजयीति सत्त्वभिमतं प्रज्ञावतां यद्यपि

स्नेहं शाश्वतसूत्रबद्धहृदयं त्वस्मादृशो मन्यते ।

भावप्लावविलुप्तभाषणमतो दीना कृति न्यर्प्यते

स्वर्गेऽपि प्रमदाय चेद् भवति सा घन्या वयं सर्वथा ॥

एतस्माद् भुवनाद् विधे विलसितं यद्यप्यनैषीद् युवा-

भात्मानं त्वविनश्वरं न हृतवद् व्यक्तैव वा संस्पृष्टिः ।

अक्षम्ये सुलभाय पुण्यनिलये शान्ति र्यथा शाश्वतो

गौरीशङ्करपादवन्दनविधौ नित्यं तथा प्रार्थये ॥

अवतरणिका

“वागर्थाविव सम्पृक्तो वागर्थप्रतिपत्तये ।
जगतः पितरो वन्दे पार्वतीपरमेश्वरो” ॥

भक्त्याचार्यान् नमस्कृत्य परिगृह्याशिषं हृदा ।
नैपथीयोपमातत्त्वं किञ्चिदत्र विचार्यते ॥

क्व न्विदं गहनं काव्यं क्व बाह्यमतिमन्दधीः ।
चापल्यं मे बुधश्चेष्टैः क्षम्यतामनुकम्पया ॥

दोषाः स्युर्बहव इवास्मिन्नपाटवं स्फुटं तथा ।
दिनेन्द्रस्य हि यज् ज्योति न तद् दीपेषु लक्ष्यते ॥

“संसारविषवृक्षस्य द्वे एव मधुरे फले ।
काव्यामृतरसास्वादः सङ्गमः सुजनैः सह ॥”

तस्मान्मे व्यापृति यैयं नन्दनाय सचेतसाम् ।
सफला सा न वेत्यस्मिन् विचारे प्रभवन्तु ते ॥

नाशा मां महती कापि प्रणोदयति कर्मणे ।
भारतीचरणाम्भोजसेवामात्रं विधीयते ॥

FOREWORD

The *Naiṣadhīyacarita* or *Naiṣadhacarita* of Śrīharṣa has a place all its own among the *Mahākāvyas* in Sanskrit literature. In nobility of theme, delineation of characters, perfection of rhythmic expression and depth of thought it has set a standard for others to follow. That its author was at once a philosopher and a poet is amply borne out by the wealth of wisdom it contains and the beauty of expression it manifests.

Though we have gloated over its excellence and extolled it as a supreme work of poetic art, unfortunately we have not tried seriously to plumb its depths. Critical study of the works of Sanskrit poets is a rarity and hence a true evaluation or assessment of their work is hardly found. It is, however, a pleasure to find that young scholars in Sanskrit have turned their attention to intensive critical study of the great works of Sanskrit poets of the past. The present monograph of Prof. Pratap Bandyopadhyay is an instance to the point. He has made a very deep and detailed study of the famous work of Śrīharṣa and has tried to cull out the beauties and special characteristics of the similes employed therein by the poet. Though the scope of Prof. Bandyopadhyay's work is very limited as he concentrates only on

one *alaṅkāra*, yet it holds up the poet in a new light which adds to our awe and admiration for him as we learn of the wealth of wide variety of his similes.

Upamā, the primary of all *alaṅkāras*, is rather the soul of Sanskrit poetry and the success of a poet depends on the apt and deft use of this *alaṅkāra*. Nobody can doubt that Kālidāsa enjoys the unique position among Sanskrit poets mainly because of the excellence of his similes. But we often forget that *Upamā* was not the privilege of Kālidāsa alone. Other poets also have employed the beauty of similes successfully and Prof. Bandyopadhyay has done a great service in drawing our attention to the excellence and variety of similes in the *Naiṣadha-carita*. This will help not only in making a new assessment of the great work of Śrīharṣa but also encourage students of Sanskrit literature to make such intensive study from different points of view of this work and similar other works of Sanskrit poets of eminence.

Prof. Bandyopadhyay, before dealing actually with the *Naiṣadha-carita*, has made a valuable discussion about the importance of *alaṅkāra* in poetry. He has used the term *upamā* in a broader sense covering under it all *alaṅkāras* based on similarity. He has also taken pains to prove that though Śrīharṣa flourished in an age of decline of Sanskrit poetry when artificial construction and complex word-play happened to be extolled, he rose above the spirit of his age and made a

distinct contribution to real poetry. Whether one agrees or not with the views of Prof. Bandyopadhyay, one would certainly be struck by the sincerity and zeal with which he has studied this great poet for a correct and genuine appreciation of his work.

Govindagopal Mukhopadhyaya,

BURDWAN,
25.3.66.

*Professor and Head of the Department
of Sanskrit, University of Burdwan.*

PREFACE

Śrīharṣa's *Naiṣadhacarita* does not require any introduction to the students of Indian literature. Though he flourished in a period of decadence, as opined by some modern critics, Śrīharṣa has left an indelible impress on the mind of his readers. The popularity of the poem is well indicated by the number of commentaries on it. The present dissertation seeks to study the salient features of Śrīharṣa's similes. The origin of the use of simile can be traced to the very early period of the history of human speech. The Vedic texts show beautiful examples of conveying ideas through comparisons. The term *upamā* occurs even in the *gveda*.¹ Right up to the present era poets, litterateurs and also philosophers have been using

1 e.g., *tvam agne prayata-dakṣiṇaṁ naraṁ*

varmeva syūtaṁ pari pāsi viśvataḥ/

svādu-kṣadmā yo vasatau syonaḥ/

jīva-yājanṁ yajate sopamā divaḥ/

(R. V., I/31/15)

sahasrasām āgni-veśiṁ grṇiṣe

śatrim agna upamāṁ ketum aryah/

tam mā āpaḥ saṁyataḥ pīpayanta

tasmin kṣatram amavat treṣam astu/

(R. V., V/34/9)

similes and metaphors to make their statements clear, concise and more appealing. In our everyday life also we express ideas by drawing similes from prominent objects and concepts. Instead of giving a detailed description of an object we very often compare it with another known object in order to give a clear picture of the former. Any such expression, however, does not constitute an *Upamā Alaṅkāra*. In order to be an *Alaṅkāra* it must have a striking feature (*vaicitrya*) which is the *sine qua non* of poetic expression. The uniqueness of the work of a poet lies in the fact that it makes even ordinary ideas charming (*camatkāra*) by endowing them with the resources of poetic art. The *modus operandi* of these resources varies in each poet. We have tried to point out how Śrīharṣa has succeeded in this field by way of commenting on the literary appeal of the various types of simile used by him in the *Naiṣadhacarita*.

The first three sections of the book act as introductory to our dissertation. If *Rasa* be the quintessence of poetry, the use of poetic figures, it may be contended, ought not to mark the excellence of a poetical work. We have, therefore, shown in Sec. I that the importance of *Alaṅkāras* has not been denied by the different rhetoricians since they really enhance the beauty of poetry even though its soul is *Rasa*. Sec. II deals with the meaning of the term *upamā* which is the subject of our discourse. As it is necessary to have

a general knowledge of the poet and his works before studying a particular aspect of a poem, ■ short introduction to Śrīhaṛṣa and his conception of poetry has been given in Sec. III. The next section forms the discourse proper, viz., on the salient features of the similes used in the *Naiṣadhīya*, while the last section presents ■ general conclusion.

It has to be remembered that nothing said by a particular writer on a subject can be accepted as the last word on the same and it is more so in the case of a literary appreciation which is bound to be primarily subjective. Our comments may not, therefore, necessarily tally with the viewpoints of others. Disagreement is always welcome : *vyākhyā buddhi-balāpekṣā sā nopekṣyā sukhon-mukhī.*¹ We have, however, abided by the texts and have relied less on the commentaries except when necessary to support our contentions. This will also account for the brevity of our comments.

A few verses quoted and explained in the book may appear to some to be too erotic and as such amounting to be vulgar. It needs to be remembered here that literary standard varies from period to period and it is vitally related to the radical change in society. What appears to be vulgar today did not appear so a few centuries back to the

poet who wrote it, nor to his readers. Besides the standard of vulgarity in art or literature is not the same as that in actual life. Had it been so, world literature would have left a void in its forum. What is avoided or omitted in real life is beautifully depicted in art and never does it appear to be vulgar. Herein lies its uncommon charm. The basic condition of aesthetic pleasure is that the *Sāmājika* has to be oblivious of his external bindings. The charge of vulgarism does not, therefore, stand.

In presenting this humble work to my readers I would like to express my deep debt of gratitude to those who have made it possible for me to undertake the publication. The work was originally in the form of an essay under the caption "Similes In The Naiṣadhacarita" read in the Section on Classical Sanskrit of the 26th Session of International Congress of Orientalists held at New Delhi in January, 1964. I gratefully remember Dr. Ludwik Sternbach, Hon. Professor of Dharmaśāstra and Ancient Indian Culture, United Nations, New York who presided over the Section. But for his whole-hearted encouragement and constant inspiration from thousands of miles afar it would not have been possible for me to begin writing this book, not to speak of finishing it. What I got from this well-reputed scholar at our meeting at New Delhi and through our subsequent correspondence will remain ever fresh in my memory.

My sincere gratitude goes also to my venerable teachers Principal Prabodh Chandra Lahiri, M.A., Ph.D., Kāvya-tīrtha Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit, Visvabharati, Santiniketan and Prof. Kali Charan Sastri, M.A., Kāvya-tīrtha, Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Sanskrit College, Calcutta who have always inspired me with their invaluable words of affection that have given me much impetus to finish the work.

My revered teacher Principal Gaurinath Sastri, M.A., D.Litt. of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, in spite of his engagement in various academic and administrative activities, has revised the important portions of the work and has offered valuable suggestions. He brought for me manuscripts on Gadādhara and Cāṇḍupāṇḍita from the Oriental Institute, Baroda and the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. To him I am more than grateful. In getting those MSS active interest was taken by Prof. Biswanath Bondyopadhyay M.A. (double), Ph.D., Kāvya-tīrtha, Head of the Department of Pali, Sanskrit College, Calcutta and Sri Bijay Kumar Mukhopadhyay, M.A., Kāvya-Vyākaraṇa-tīrtha, Librarian of the same college. I gratefully acknowledge their contribution. My sincere thanks are also due to the authorities of the above-mentioned Institutes who were kind enough to lend the MSS.

My revered father Sri Dhruba Chandra Bandyopadhyay has spared no pains to see through the

manuscripts and the proofs. My revered teacher Prof. Kalidas Bhattacharya, M.A., Kāvya-tīrtha, Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Hooghly Mohsin College, Chuchura and my sincere well-wisher Prof. Ramesh Chandra Chakravarti, M.A., Lecturer in English, Vidyasagar College, Calcutta, who was my colleague during a memorable period of my life, have gladly revised the book and have given apt suggestions. No words would perhaps be capable to convey my gratitude to them.

Prof. Krishna Kanta Handiqui, M.A. (Cal. et Oxon.), ex-Vice-Chancellor, Gauhati University, whom I have unfortunately never met, has kindly permitted me to use his valuable book "Naiṣadha-carita Of Śrīharṣa". The English translations of the verses cited in my work (for the convenience of the readers) have been taken from that book except in a few cases where I have done it myself. I gladly acknowledge my indebtedness to him.

Prof. Arunoday Natvarlal Jani, M.A., Ph.D., Kāvya-tīrtha, Head of the Department of Sanskrit, M. S. University, Baroda has kindly permitted me to use his esteemed thesis "A Critical Study Of Śrīharṣa's Naiṣadhi-yacaritam" wherefrom I have used profuse materials in my work. It was a real pleasure to me to have been acquainted with this respected scholar at our meeting at New Delhi during the Session of International Congress of

Orientalists. Subsequently he has heartily encouraged me to elaborate my paper into a book and has gladly provided me with the information I wanted from him. It gives me ample pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to him.

I pay my most respectful homage to the departed soul of my celebrated teacher the late Professor Sivaprasada Bhattacharya, M.A., Sāhitya-śāstri of the Department of Post-graduate Training and Research, Sanskrit College, Calcutta with whom I had the privilege of discussing some important points and got therefrom new inspiration.,

It is not possible for me to express in words my gratefulness to Prof. Govindagopal Mukhopadhyay, M.A., Ph.D., Sāṅkhyatīrtha, Head of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Burdwan who has readily agreed to write a foreword to the book and has also offered some valuable suggestions to improve its worth.

I beg to acknowledge the active help and the hearty words of hope and faith that I have always received from my teachers and well-wishers, specially Prof. Hemanta Kumar Ganguli, M.A., Kāvya-Sāṅkhyatīrtha, Senior Lecturer in Sanskrit, Jadavpur University, Prof. Rajatabaran Dattaray, M.A., Assistant Professor of Sanskrit, Sanskrit College, Calcutta, Prof. Bratindra Kumar Sengupta, M.A., D.Phil., Reader in Sanskrit, University of Burdwan, Prof. Siddhesvar Chatto-

padhyay, M.A., Kāvya-tīrtha, Senior Lecturer in Sanskrit, University of Burdwan and Prof. Brahmananda Gupta, M.A., Ph. D., Department of Post-graduate Training and Research, Sanskrit College, Calcutta. To my friends Prof. Panchanan Ghatak, M.A., Lecturer in Sanskrit, Krishnath College, Berhampore, Prof. Dipak Ghosh, M.A., Lecturer in Sanskrit, Anandamohan College, Calcutta and Sri Kartik Chandra Saha, M.A. I convey my hearty thanks for what I have got from them.

My sincere thanks are due to the authorities of different institutions, viz., the National Library, Calcutta, the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, the Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat, Calcutta and the British Council, Calcutta, not to speak of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, my *Alma Mater*, for the various helps I have received from them. I also thankfully acknowledge the receipt of information supplied by the Booksellers' Publishing Co., Bombay.

I shall be failing in my duty if I forget to offer my hearty thanks to the Organising Committee, XXVI International Congress of Orientalists for accepting my paper presented in the Section on Classical Sanskrit of the Congress and to my former employing authorities, the Governing Body, Vidyasagar College, Calcutta for giving me all facilities—far in excess of my expectations—to attend the Congress.

After my paper was read in the Classical Sanskrit Section of the Orientalists' Congress,

a discussion on the same was held by some delegates headed by Professor V. Venkatachalam, M.A., Vedānta-Śiromaṇi-Viśārada of Ujjain, with whom I have subsequently come in close contact. I have gladly made the best use of the suggestions offered by them as far as they are acceptable to me. I thank them sincerely for the same.

I do not know how to thank Sri Shyamapada Bhattacharya of Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Calcutta who has taken special interest in publishing this book. My sincerest thanks are also due to Sri Devaprasada Mitra of the Elm Press, Calcutta who has been kind enough to print it and to Sri Prafulla Kumar Nath of the same press who has worked with all sincerity in publishing it.

I claim to be nothing more than an ordinary student of Indology. In spite of my carefulness a number of flaws might have crept in—not to speak of the printing mistakes, as I could not get an adept assistant at the time of proof-reading. I hope, my sympathetic readers will excuse me following the maxim—

*gacchataḥ skhalanaṁ kvāpi
bhavatyeva pramūdataḥ/
hasanti durjanās tatra
samādadhati sajjanāḥ*

6, Cornfield Road,
Namitā-smṛti,
Calcutta-19.
Nava-varṣa,
1373 (Bengali).

Pratap Bandyopadhyay.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	ix
Preface	xiii
I. The Importance Of <i>Alaṃkāra</i> In A Piece Of Poetry	1
II. What Is An <i>Upamā</i> ?	5
III. A Short Introduction To Śrīhaṛṣa And His Conception Of Poetry	9
IV. The Salient Features Of The Similes Used In The <i>Naiṣadhacarita</i> :	18
Concrete objects compared with abstract things—a mark of Kālidāśian Similes	19
Abstract things compared with concrete objects	21
Various objects used as standard of comparison	23
Mythical, religious, philosophical and other scholastic ideas	35
Ideas from social, economic and political fields	64
Erotic ideas	84
Humorous ideas	89

<i>Rhetorical devices</i>	...	105
<i>Linguistic features</i>	...	116
V. Conclusion	...	126
Addenda	...	129
A Select Bibliography	...	137

OBSERVATIONS ON SIMILES IN THE NAIṢADHACARITA

I

The Importance Of *Alaṁkāra* In A Piece Of Poetry

Though the rhetoricians of the new school of thought have admitted *Rasa* or sentiment to be the quintessence of poetry, they have not denied the importance of *Alaṁkāras* or figures of speech. The science of poetics is known as *Alaṁkāra-śāstra* in Sanskrit though its scope is far wider than what appears to be from the mere term *alaṁkāra*. The very fact that the entire science goes by the name *Alaṁkāra-śāstra* shows the importance laid by the rhetorician on the *Alaṁkāras* or figures of speech.

Vāmana, the renowned rhetorician of the 8th century A.D. and the champion of the *Rīti* school of thought, has boldly asserted that the very appeal of poetry lies in the use of *Gūṇa* and *Alaṁkāra* and the avoidance of *Doṣa*. Cf. *kāvyaṁ grāhyam alaṁkārat/ saundaryam alaṁkārah/ sa doṣa-guṇālaṁkāra-hānādānābhyām*.¹ Bhāmaha

1. *Kāvyaṁ alaṁkāra-sūtra-rīti*, I/1/1-3.

also has laid the same importance on the use of poetic figures when he says : *na kāntam api nirbhū-
ṣaṁ vibhāti vanitā-mukham.*¹

Mammaṭa has added the epithet *analam-
kṛtī punaḥ kvāpi* to *śabdārthau* which speaks
of the body of poetry. His own interpretation
thereof is this : *sarvatra sālanīkārau kvacit tu
sphuṭālanīkāra-virahe 'pi na kāvya-tva-hāniḥ,*² that
is to say, there must be some poetic figures in
a piece of poetry—they are somewhere very dis-
tinct, somewhere not so. It is clear, therefore,
that according to Mammaṭa there cannot be any
piece of poetry which is completely bereft of figures
of speech.

Rhetoricians like Jagannātha and Viśvanātha
did not consider *Alaṁkāra* to be an indispen-
sable attribute of poetry ; so they did not men-
tion it in the definition of poetry.³ But they
could not deny that *Alaṁkāra* enhances the beauty
of poetry, and consequently discussed the figures
of speech at length.⁴ The role of *Alaṁkāra*
in a piece of poetry is comparable to that of
bracelets, eardrops, etc. on a human body.
Cf. *alaṁkāraś ca kaṭaka-kuṇḍalādivat.*⁵ The real

significance of this comparison becomes clearer when we remember the remark of Bhāmaha quoted before : *na kāntam api nirbhūṣaṁ vibhāti vanitā-mukham* (the face of a lady, though beautiful, does not shine without ornaments).

In the scheme of *Dhvani* also the *Alaṁkāras* have a special function. Ānandavardhana has elaborately discussed it in the second 'flash' (*Udyota*) of his *Dhvanyāloka*. The *Dhvanikāra*, who claims *Rasa-dhvani* (which is *Dhvani par excellence*) as the soul of poetry,¹ indicates in the following verse when *Alaṁkāra* should be regarded as an important factor in poetry :—

*rasākṣiptatayā yasya
bandhaḥ śakyakriyo bhavet/
aprthag-yatna-nirvartyaḥ
so 'lāṁkāro dhvanau mataḥ*²

This verse clearly says that the *Alaṁkāras* are significant only in so far as they are related to the development of sentiment and for this purpose they must come out spontaneously from the poet's pen without any special effort on his part. Hence it is clear that these *Alaṁkāras* do not hamper the sentiment ; on the contrary, they contribute much to its development. Abhinavagupta is very clear when he comments :—

rasa-samavadhānena vibhūvādi-ghaṭanām eva

1. See *Dhvanyāloka*, I/5 and the *Vṛtti* thereon.

2. *Dhvanyāloka*, II/16.

*kurvaṁs tan-nāntarīyakatayā yam āsādayati sa evālaṁkāro rasamārge nānyaḥ.*¹

Abhinavagupta has, here, clearly pointed out that *Alaṁkāras* are *Alaṁkāras* only in so far as they help the development of sentiment being a very natural factor in supplying *Vibhāva* etc. ('*tan-niṣpādaka-yatna-niṣpādyatvena*'—says the *Bāla-priyā* commentary).

The science of poetics has no meaning at all unless it is referred to the works of the great poets. As the rules of grammar follow the actual uses in the current language,² so also the theories of rhetoricians are based on the great literary compositions already appreciated by critics.³ As a matter of fact, in the works of the great poets like Kālidāsa we find that the figures of speech have been freely used, and nowhere they appear to be a hindrance to the enjoyment of literary or aesthetic beauty.

II

What Is An *Upamā* ?

It is claimed that Kālidāsa had perfect mastery of using different figures of speech, specially *Upamā* or simile. There is an oft-quoted verse which runs thus :—

*upamā kālidāsasya
bhūraver artha-gauravam/
naiṣadhe pada-lālityam
māghe santi trayo guṇāḥ*¹

Now the question is : What is an *Upamā* ? The figure *Upamā* has been defined by Viśvanātha as—

*sāmyam vācyaṁ avaidharmyam vākyaikya
upamā dvayoh.*²

1. There is another reading, viz., *daṇḍinah* for *naiṣadhe* in the third foot of the verse. The argument of those who accept this reading is mainly this : In the first, second and the fourth feet the names of the poets, viz., Kālidāsa, Bhāravi and Māgha have been mentioned. So it is quite natural that in the third foot also the name of the poet and not of his work should occur. As *Naiṣadha*(*carita*) is the name of the work of Śrīharṣa, the reading gives rise to incongruity. But this argument rests on purely formal propriety and the reading *daṇḍinah padalālityam* does less conform to fact. Daṇḍin can by no means be compared with Śrīharṣa so far as the 'elegance of words' is concerned.

2. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, X/17.

When two objects are compared in one sentence without any mention of their point of difference and when the similarity is clearly expressed (not suggested), it is a case of *Upamā Alaṅkāra*. As an example of this figure of speech, we may quote the following verse of Kālidāsa :—

*tām arpayāmāsa ca śoka-dīnāni
tad-āgama-prītiṣu tāpasīṣu/
nirviṣṭa-sārāṇi pitṛbhir himāniśor
antyāni kalāni darśa ivaṣadhīṣu//¹*

The verse is a description of sage Vālmīki entrusting the protection of Sītā, afflicted with agony, to the female ascetics of his hermitage who were glad to receive her. The simile has been drawn from the day of new moon transmitting the last digit of the moon, whose essence is drunk up by the manes, to the herbs and plants. Here Vālmīki has been compared with the day of new moon (*Darśa* or *Amāvāsyā*) ; Sītā, afflicted with utmost agony, with the last digit of the moon ; and the female ascetics, receiving Sītā, with the herbs and plants receiving the last lunar digit. The common attribute happens to be 'transmission' which has been clearly stated, the word expressing the point of similarity being *iva* in the fourth foot of the verse. Though there is much difference between Vālmīki and the day of new moon, Sītā and the last lunar digit, female ascetics and the

herbs and plants, yet the purpose of the verse is not to point to that. The verse thus happens to be an example of *Upamā* (simile) according to the definition quoted above.

Clarification of an object-described is the main purpose of using a simile. A description may be complete in itself, but when it is compared with another known object, it becomes more clear and hence better. This is why great poets do not rest satisfied with describing an object in as many words as possible, but they do simply draw a simile instead. The more appropriate the standard of comparison is, the more appealing the simile becomes. The following verse of Kālidāsa is, in this respect, a very appropriate example of simile :—

*puraskṛtā vartmani pārthivena
pratyudgatā pārthiva-dharmapatnyā/
tad-antare sū virarūḍha dhenur
dina-kṣapū-madhyagateva sandhyā*¹

Here is a description of Nandinī, the female cow of sage Vasiṣṭha, followed by king Dilīpa behind and received by queen Sudakṣiṇā in front in the hermitage of the sage. Nandinī remaining in between the king and the queen has been compared with the evening twilight which also comes in between the day and the night. The point to be specially noticed here is that, the time of the

1. *Raghuvamśa*, II/20.

incident is actually the evening twilight (*sandhyā*) from which the simile has been drawn. Consequently the comparison has been a very appropriate one in the sense that it does not tax the imagination of the reader. It is this appropriateness of the comparison which has made the verse so beautiful. The verse is thus an ideal example of simile for which Kālidāsa is noted in Sanskrit literature. Critics are so much appreciative of Kālidāsa's similes because they befit excellently the time, space, speaker and context of a description and thus serve best the very purpose of using similes.

In the expression *upamā kālidāsasya*, however, the term *upamā* seems to have been used in a general sense, i.e., it stands for any figure based on comparison, because the merit of a poet cannot be judged from the use of a particular figure of speech. We shall take the term in this general sense and not in its special sense as discussed before.

Our object is to show that not only Kālidāsa but also Śrīharṣa, the author of the *Naiṣadhacarita* has proved his mastery of handling *Upamā* in order to embellish his poetic composition. The verse quoted above points to Kālidāsa's 'simile', Bhāravi's 'profundity of sense' and Śrīharṣa's 'elegance of words'. Accordingly many critics hardly pause to think of the other excellences of these poets, and that is certainly a great injustice to them.

III

A Short Introduction To Śrīharṣa And His Conception Of Poetry

In the brilliant galaxy of the Indian poets Śrīharṣa is a prominent figure, and of the post-Kālidāśian Sanskrit writers of court epic poetry we consider him to be the best. The question of his date, as in the case of most of the Indian poets and authors, still offers no decisive answer. As regards his lineage, he himself says that he is the son of Śrīhīra and Māmalladevī.¹ At the end of the *Naiṣadhacarita* and also of the *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khāḍya* the poet says that he received two betel-leaves and a seat (of honour) from the king of Kāṇyakubja.² Accordingly some scholars hold that Śrīharṣa might have flourished under Jayacandra of Kanauj in the 12th century A.D. Professor A. A. Macdonell and Dr. G. Bühler also accept the latter half of the 12th century as the date of Śrīharṣa. Professor Sivaprasad Bhattacharjee places him before the middle of the twelfth century, at least a decade prior to it. According to him, Śrīharṣa flourished under king Vijayacandra of Kanauj. Dr. A. N. Jani

1. Cf. *śrīhīraḥ suṣuve jitendriyacayaṁ māmalladevī ca yam/* (occurring in the colophon verse of all the cantos of the *Naiṣadhīya*).

2. Cf. *tāmbūla-dvayam āsanaṁ ca labhate yaḥ kāṇyakubjeś-varāt* (N.C., XXII/155/A ; also *Khaṇḍana*, concluding verse 2/A).

has elaborately discussed the different views regarding the date of Śrīharṣa.¹ On the internal evidence supplied by the *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khāḍya*, a philosophical work of our poet, which refers to, and quotes, in many places, the arguments of Udayana, Professor Jani asserts that A.D. 1020 is the upper limit of Śrīharṣa's date. On the external evidence of the quotation of the *Naiṣadha-carita* by Mahendrasūri in his commentary called *Anekārtha-kairavākara-kaumudī* on the *Anekārtha-saṁgraha* of Hemacandrācārya, the learned scholar has ascertained A.D. 1180 as the lower limit of Śrīharṣa's date. As "all dates given in Indian literary history are pins set up to be bowled down again,"² we do not like to dilate upon this point. For us it matters little when he was born and how long he lived. As a great poet Śrīharṣa lives for ever.

There is a tradition that Mammāṭa, the renowned rhetorician, generally believed to have flourished in the 12th century, was the maternal uncle of Śrīharṣa. Scholars like Weber and Hall relied much upon this tradition. Mammāṭa was most probably a Kashmirian. Therefore, according to those who believe in the said tradition Śrīharṣa was also a Kashmirian. The upholders

1. See 'A Critical Study Of Śrīharṣa's Naiṣadhiyacaritam' by Dr. A. N. Jani, Bīrodā, 1957 ; pp. 123-129.

2. W. D. Whitney, 'Sanskrit Grammar', Second Edition, London, 1923 ; Introduction, p. XIX.

of this view refer to the colophon verse, of Canto XVI where it is stated that the *Naiṣadhatarita* was much appreciated by the Kashmirian scholars.¹ Some, again, connect him with Kanauj as he is believed to have been patronised by Jayacandra, king of Kanauj. Some other scholars, on the other hand, connect him with Banaras. It has to be remembered here that Jayacandra, king of Kanauj, was also the king of Banaras and lived mostly there.² So it is not quite impossible that Śrīharṣa, though patronised by 'Kāṇyakubjeśvara', belonged to Banaras. The view appears to be more probable when we find that in the eleventh Canto of his poem, while describing the tradition and sanctity of Banaras, the poet's heart overflows with emotion, as in the case of Kālidāsa while describing the city of Ujjayinī in the first half of the *Meghadūta*.³ The verses therein are highly poetical and every expression speaks of the innermost feelings of the poet. This outburst of emotion may be due to the

1. *kāśmīrair mahīte caturdaśatayīnī vidyānī vidadbhir mahā-kāvyē tad-bhuvī naiṣadhīyacarite sargo 'gamat śoḍaśah||*
(N.C., XVI/130/C-D)

2. See 'An Advanced History Of India' by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri and Dr. Kalikinkar Datta, Second Edition, London, 1961 ; pp. 277-279.

3. Cf. N.C. XI/112-118 (*etasya sāvanibhujah kula-rāja-dhānī.....dhanyē vahatyamṛta-satram avāritārthi||*) and *Meghadūta*, I/28-40 (*vakraḥ panthā yadapi kila te.....mā sma bhūr viklavās tāh||*)

fact that Banaras was the home-land of the poet, though one cannot draw any such definite conclusion from this. It may be pointed out, however, that in Jaina Rājaśekhara Sūri's *Prabandhakōśa* Śrīharṣa has actually been associated with Jayantacandra, king of Banaras and the recognition of his work by the king and scholars of Kashmir has also been narrated there.¹ Gadādhara in his commentary on the *Naiṣadhīya* has, however, connected him with king Govindacandra of Banaras.

On the evidence of a good number of Bengali customs² and features of Bengali expressions³ noticed in the *Naiṣadhacarita* a group of scholars claim Śrīharṣa to be a native of Bengal. Professor Jani also supports this view. As he thinks A.D. 1180 to be the lower limit of Śrīharṣa's date, it may be that Śrīharṣa graced, at least for a short period, the court of Lakṣmaṇa Sena of Bengal who patronised great poets like Jayadeva and Dhoyī and who, according to many scholars, began to rule in A.D. 1178-79.⁴ As regards Śrīharṣa's

1. Vide *Prabandhakōśa*, 11 (*Harṣa-kavi-prabandha*).

2. e.g., use of vermilion (XV/55), use of conch-bracelets (XV/45), *ulūlu-dhvanī* (XIV/49), sumptuous marriage feast (Canto XVI), etc.

3. e.g., *janānane kaḥ karam arpayiṣyati* (IX/124). = lit. Beng. *loker mukhe hāt debe ke ?*

bhavantyaraṇye ruditaṁ na me girah (IX/96)—

cf. Beng. *araṇye rodan*. And so on.

4. Some scholars push back the date of Lakṣmaṇa Sena and regard him as the founder of Lakṣmaṇa era of A.D. 1119.

connection with '*Kāṇyakubjeśvara*' (N.C., XXII/155) this much may be said that it is quite possible for a king, appreciative of real merits, to pay tribute and honour to a poet of the court of another king.

Of the works of Śrīharṣa only two have come down to us. One is the *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khādyam*, a great philosophical work of Advaita dialectics, and the other is the *Naiṣadhacaritam* (also known as *Naiṣadhīyam*), an epic poem (*Mahā-kāvya*) dealing with the love-episode of Nala and Damayanti narrated in the *Vana-parvan* of the *Mahābhārata*. Some other works, such as *Śṛṅgārahārāvalī*, *Amarakhaṇḍana*, *Dvirū-pakośa*, *Jūnakīgītā*, etc. are also attributed by some scholars to Śrīharṣa. The other works of the poet, which are mentioned in the epilogue stanzas of a number of cantos of the *Naiṣadhacarita* but have not come down to us, are as follows :—

Sthairya-vicāraṇa-prakarāṇa (IV/123),

Vijaya-praśasti (V/138),

Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khādyā (VI/113),

Gauḍorvīśa-kula-praśasti (VII/109),

Aṇava-varṇana (IX/159),

Chinda-praśasti (XVII/220),

Śiva-śakti-siddhi (XVIII/149),

Nava-sāhasāṅka-carita or *Nṛpa-sāhasāṅka-carita*
(XXII/151).

(See 'An Advanced History Of India' by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri and Dr. Kalikinkar Datta, Second Edition, London, 1961 ; p. 188). In that case also Śrīharṣa may well be placed in the time of Lakṣmaṇa Sena.

There was another work, namely *Īśvarābhisandhi*, mentioned many a time in the *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khādya*. As we know nothing of these compositions excepting the *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khādya*, they cannot be the object of our judgement. As regards literary criticism, the *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khādya* also should be left out of any judgement, inasmuch as it is purely a philosophical work ; and Śrīharṣa as the author of this book is not a poet, but a philosopher.

The *Naiṣadhacarita* is composed of twenty-two cantos. According to some scholars, it is incomplete, the portion after these twenty-two cantos being lost. But there is no definite proof in favour of this opinion. Whatever may be the case, Śrīharṣa's poetic genius is nicely revealed in these few cantos that have come down to us and an analysis of this extant form is sufficient for our study.

Before entering into the actual subject of our discussion it is wise to add a few words on Śrīharṣa's conception of poetry. As simplicity is the soul of language, poets like Kālidāsa always used simple language to give expression to their thoughts. Never did they veil their thoughts in gorgeous and ambiguous words. But after Kālidāsa there came a time in the history of Indian literature when poets began to lay more stress on the use of an involved style of language and a complex form of poetry. This indicated the beginning of the period of artificial poetry of which Bhāravi is said to be the father. The line was followed

by Kumāradāsa, Māgha and other poets. Bhā-ravi's 'profundity of sense' (*artha-gaurava*) received appreciation from his critics, but in most of the cases it was at the cost of the simplicity of language. Again, some of these poets were always ready to exhibit their scholarship in their compositions. Poetry, to them, did not always mean simply 'the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings', but also some sort of pedanticism mixed with literary art. Śrīharṣa being a poet of this age, his poem is likely to be marked by this feature, and if it really be so, it is not a defect on the poet's own part, but rather the influence of the age when he flourished. As a matter of fact, however, Śrīharṣa did not follow the line of his predecessors and tried to create something new in that age of artificiality. His poem is sweet and graceful, mostly simple and lucid, and is rightly claimed to be 'the last great poem of Sanskrit literature'.¹ Of course there is no denying the fact that Śrīharṣa also is hardly hesitant to exhibit the width of his knowledge in different branches of lore, and accordingly there has been a remark—*naiṣadham vidvad-auṣadham* ; but it is a unique feature of his style that even his exhibition of scholarship does rarely mar the intrinsic spirit of poetry. Even when there is a pedantic idea or expression, it has been so nicely fitted that the reader does not find anything to object to. Word and sense

1. 'Naiṣadharita Of Śrīharṣa' by Prof. Krishna Kanta Handiqui, Second Edition, Poona, 1956 ; Introduction, p. XVII.

—these two combined constitute poetry,¹ and Śrīharsa was never forgetful of this poetic principle. While composing verses like the one which contains no other consonant than *ṇ* (except a *t* in the end)² poets like Bharavi were so much absorbed in playing with words that they were totally heedless of the sense element. Śrīharsa's word plays never go to such extreme. The verses in Canto XIII uttered by Sarasvatī to Damayantī which are capable of more interpretations than one (even five in XIII/33), however, should not be cited to foil our contention, because, those utterances of Sarasvatī had a definite purpose of confounding Damayantī. Śrīharsa was both a poet and a scholar, but his scholarship never got the better of his poetic genius which was inborn in him,³ it never impeded the spontaneous flow of the latter.

It is improper to expect the literary art of Kalidasa in the work of Śrīharsa. But if he be judged on his own, we are bound to find some-

1 As Bhamaha puts it —*śabdārthau sahitaṁ kāvyam* (Bhamahalekhikā I/16)

Cf 'Great literature is simply language charged with meaning to the utmost possible degree' —Ezra Pound *How To Read Part II* (Literary Essays Of Ezra Pound, edited by T S Eliot London 1954 ■ 23)

2 Vide *Kirātārjunīya* XV/14

3 Cf *Poeta nascitur, non fit* (A poet is born not made) —An old Latin phrase

thing novel, something unconventional in his work. The *Naiṣadhacarita* is remarkable for development of sentiment, delineation of characters, picturesque descriptions and excellent use of various poetic figures and metres. We are to judge the poet in Śrīharṣa and not the scholar. By no means should we criticise his scholarship if it does not belittle the real merit of his work. The scope of our study is, however, very limited, the subject being only a study of the salient features of the similes used in the *Naiṣadhacarita*.


IV

The Salient Features Of The Similes Used In The *Naiṣadhacarita*

The *Naiṣadhacarita* is a brilliant star in the constellation of Sanskrit poems and has been justly included in the list of *pañca mahākāvya* (the five great court epics)¹. Of the different factors that have made the poem so prominent and popular one is the excellent use of the figures of speech, specially *Upamā* or simile. The similes that have embellished the poem have been drawn from various concrete objects as well as abstract ideas ; and almost in each case they have been very significant and appropriate to the context. In order to appreciate these similes the critic has to be completely unbiased and impartial. Each poet has a vision of his own ; and while judging him we have to see how far he has succeeded in his own way. The work of one poet cannot be adjudged or appreciated by the norm of another. So, though the similes of Śrīharsa are not always of the same nature as those of Kālidāsa, that has nothing to detract from their real excellence

1. The other four are . Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* and Kumāra-sambhava, Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya* and Māgha's *Śiśupāla-vadha*

We may now proceed to discuss the salient features of the similes used in the *Naiṣadhacarita*. As it is not possible to cite all the examples within this short compass, we shall take up a few prominent number of examples and discuss them in brief.



Concrete objects compared with abstract things— a mark of Kālidāśian similes

If we consider minutely the similes of Śrī-harṣa we shall not fail to see that many of them are marked by the characteristics of Kālidāśian similes. One of the most appealing characteristics of Kālidāśa's similes is the comparison of concrete objects with abstract things in order to produce a greater rhetorical and sentimental effect. As a beautiful example of this we may quote the following half of a verse of the *Megha-dūta* where the mount Kailāsa has been compared with the accumulated laughter of Lord Śiva in order to give as full an idea as possible of its white lofty peaks :—

*śṛīgocchrūyaiḥ kumuda-viśadair
yo vitatyā sthitaḥ khaṇi*

*rāsibhūtaḥ pratidinam iva
tryambakasyattahāsaḥ||*

(I/61/C-D)

“Which stands occupying the sky with its peaks white like lotuses, as if it were the loud laugh of Siva accumulated day by day”¹

In Śrīharsa also we notice this feature. Thus describing the city of Kundina the poet says —

*vidhu dīdhiti-jena yat patham
payasū naisadha śīla-śītalam/
śasi-kānta mayam tapūgame
kalī tīras tapati sma nātapaḥ||*

(II/94)

‘At the advent of summer, the heat² as severe as the Kali age did not heat the city’s highway of moonstones, cool like Nala’s temper, owing to the flow of water in contact with the rays of the moon’³. Here, by comparing the heat of the sun with Kali, whose severity will be clear subsequently in this very poem, the poet has very skilfully suggested the severity of the heat, and similarly by comparing the highway with the character of Nala, the hero, the poet has uniquely suggested how cool the way was. We can boldly assert that no

1 M E Kale

2 (of the sun)

3 Prof Krishna Kanta Handiqui

other simile would have been more appropriate for the purpose.

Again, depicting the picture of Damayantī, the heroine, who, realising her own helpless condition by the words of Nala, begins to shed tears, the poet says :—

*imā giras tasya vicintya cetasā
tatheti sampratyayam āsasāda sāl
nivāritāvagraha-nīra-nirjhare
nabho-nabhasyatvam alambhayad dṛśau//*
(IX/84)

“Weighing in her mind these words of his, she was convinced that so it was, and with a gush of tears let loose, she then reduced her eyes to the condition of the months of Śrāvaṇa and Bhādra.”¹ The same rhetorical effect is produced by comparing the eyes of Damayantī, shedding tears, with the months of Śrāvaṇa and Bhādra. Tears were copiously falling from her eyes; and as the months of Śrāvaṇa and Bhādra produce excessive rain, the simile has become very appropriate.

Abstract things compared with concrete objects

Not only is the poet inclined to compare the concrete with the abstract, but the converse is also found. In a simile of this type the main idea becomes more clear and the description more

picturesque Thus, of the hero's scholarship the poet says —

*amusa vidya rasanagra nartakī
trayīva nītanga gunena vistaram|
agahatustādaśatam jigīśaya
nava dhaya dvīpa prthag-java sriyam||*
(I/5)

“Learning, ■ dancer on the tip of his tongue became eighteenfold like the three Vedas multiplied by the (six) Vedāṅgas as if out of a desire to conquer the sovereignty of each of the eighteen islands’¹ The comparison between learning and a dancer here is a fine example of the abstract compared with the concrete The aptness of the comparison lies in the fact that both learning and a dancer attract others Then it is compared with the Vedas and the significance thereof is to indicate its vastness importance and sanctity

Again of Nala's military power it is said —

*sphurad dhanur nisvana tad ghanāśuga
pragalbha vṛstī vyavitasya saṅgare|
niṛṛṣya tejah śikhinah parah śatā
vitemur argaram nāyasah pare||*
(I/9)

“His numerous enemies spread their disgrace, as if it were the charcoal left by the fire of their valour,

1 Prof Handique

quenched in battle by the copious rain of arrows loosed by him, who was, as it were, a cloud with the sound of his flashing bow.”¹ Here also, the infamy of the enemies, which is abstract, has been likened to the concrete charcoal for a high rhetorical effect. The black image of charcoal portrays vividly how much disgraced the enemies were. In this way, by comparing abstract things with concrete objects Śrīharṣa has been able to make his descriptions more clear, picturesque and vivid—which is decidedly the main purpose of using a simile.

• Various objects used as standard of comparison

Śrīharṣa’s similes are varied. From a little straw right up to the heavenly luminaries, many things have been used as *Upamāna* or standard of comparison. It gives evidence of the poet’s deep insight into Nature and natural objects. Thus, by way of showing that man is always under the sway of the Creator, the poet draws a simile from a straw following a whirlwind :—

avaśya-bhavyeṣv-anavagraha-grahā
yayā diśā dhāvati vedhasaḥ sprhā/
trṇena vātyeva tayānugamyate
janasya cittena bhṛśāvaśātmanā/
(I/120)

“Just as ■ straw follows a whirlwind, similarly the utterly uncontrolled heart of man follows the Creator’s will in the direction in which it moves, irresistible in its course in matters that are bound to be ’¹ A strong whirlwind takes a straw far away in a moment Undoubtedly, therefore, the simile of a straw following the course of a whirlwind expresses very nicely how helpless a man is under the control of Providence

Elsewhere the poet compares the uselessness of Nala’s beauty, empire and everything else without the company of Damayantī, with the fruitlessness of the flower of a ‘barren tree’, and the simile has become a very apt one The verse runs as follows —

*taya rūpam idam taya vinā
 viphalam puspam ivākesinah/
 iyam rddha-dhanā vṛthayanī
 suvanī sampravadat pīkāpī kāmī*
 (II/45)

“Without her this thy beauty is useless like the flower of a barren tree, (without her) this thy wealthy earth is useless, and what is thy pleasure-garden worth, though it has singing cuckoos ?”² The comparison with the flower of a ‘barren tree’ is highly expressive of the fruitlessness of all the possessions of Nala

1 Prof Handiqui

2. Prof Handiqui

Again, when the swan tells Damayantī that unless wedded to Nala, she cannot obtain the pleasure arising from the flattering words regarding him, the poet draws a simile from the mango-grove which cannot obtain the pleasure brought by the bees when the spring has not yet come. The verse runs thus :—

*tan naiṣadhānūḍhatayā durāpaṁ
śarma tvayāsmat-kṛta-cātu-jannma/
rasāla-vallyā madhupānuviddham
saubhāgyam aprāpta-vasantayeva//*
(III/46)

“As Nala has not married thee, thou canst not obtain the happiness arising from flattering words spoken by us ; just as a mango-grove that has not received the visit of the spring cannot obtain the happiness brought by bees.”¹ Here we find the poet’s deep insight into the spirit of natural phenomena as well as human heart. The poet finds a reflection of the condition of Damayantī without her union with Nala in that of the mango-grove without the advent of spring. There is, thus, a beautiful touch of life in the *Upamāna* which has made the simile so appealing.

The lustrous sun shining in the sky has served many beautiful similes for the genius of Kālidāsa. If we consider minutely we shall never fail to see

that all of them are very significant¹ It is interesting to note that Śrīharsa also has drawn many fine similes from the sun and each of them has been very suitable to the context Thus Nala, occupying a seat after receiving the hospitality rendered by Damayanti, has been compared with the sun shining in the Mountain of the East (*Paurastya Śaila*, i.e., *Udayācala*) and receiving the offerings brought by the people —

*paurastya-sailam janatopanītam
grhṇan yathāhnaḥ patir argha pūjam/
tathātithēyam atha sa pratīcchan
priyārpitam asanam āsasāda//*
(VIII/52)

‘Then, just as the sun, accepting the offerings of worship brought by the people occupies the mountain of the east so Nala accepting the hospitality offered by his beloved, occupied a seat’² A splendid picture is painted here in the first half of the verse When the picture of the hero and the heroine is compared with it in the second half, it attains equal charm and dignity which is the main purpose in the present context The comparison with the sun occupying the Mountain of the East

1 Cf *Sakuntala* V/4, VII/4, *Raghuvamśa* I/18 V/13, *Ānandavijaya* II/2, *Meghaduta*, II/20, and so on

2 Prof Handique

nicely reveals the majestic appearance of the hero occupying a seat. Here lies the beauty of Śrīharṣa's similes that their aim is to magnify the object of description and thus they do not turn to be mere verbosity.

Again, Nala's entrance into the city of Kuṇḍina has been described by drawing a nice simile from the solar and the lunar discs :—

*rathād asau sārathinā sanāthād
rājāvatīryātha puram viveśa/
nirgamyā bimbād iva bhūnavīyāt
saudhākaram maṇḍalam amśu-saṅghaḥ//*
(VI/7)

"Just as the mass of rays, going out of the solar disc, enters the lunar orb,¹ similarly the king then descending from the chariot, occupied by the charioteer, went into the city."² The comparison of Nala with the mass of rays has become very befitting to suggest his royal grandeur, and similarly by comparing the city with the lunar orb, the poet has skilfully hinted at its covetable environment. Several verses may be quoted to show how the same object (as we have just quoted two verses related to the sun) has been used as the standard of comparison and each time with some

1. The reference is to the fact that the moon has no light of its own, but shines by the light of the sun reflected on it.

2. Prof. Handiqui.

novelty in them This is certainly a great achievement on the part of the poet

As in Kalidasa the similes drawn from oceans and rivers have also become similarly apt and charming As for example the emotion of king Bhima in receiving Nala who came as the worthy suitor of his daughter by stretching out his arms in great delight has been expressed by comparing him (the king) with the ocean which carries on both sides the rush of waves receiving the streams of water coming from the Ganges —

*athayam utthuya visarya dor yugam
muda pratyesa tam atma janmanah/
sura sravantiya iva patram agatam
bhrtabhito vici tatih sarit patih//*
(XVI/11)

Rising and stretching out his arms in joy king Bhima then received Nala now come the worthy suitor of his daughter just as the ocean carrying a two sided rush of waves receives the flood of waters coming from the Ganga ¹ The comparison with the vast ocean has been well matched with the high personality of the king and equally befitting is the comparison of Nala with the stream of the Ganges the symbol of sanctity received by the ocean which in the present context most appro

1 Prof Handiqui

priately signifies the worthiness of Nala as a suitor of Bhīma's daughter.¹

1. Kālidāsa, in his *Raghuvamśa* (V/61), describes in ■ similar way how king Bhoja receives Aja who has come as ■ suitor of his sister Indumatī. The verse runs as follows :—

*tanī taṣṭhivārṇsaṁ nagaropakāṇṭhe
tad-āgamārūḍha-guru-praharṣaḥ/
pratyujjagāma krathakaisikendraś
candraṁ pravṛddhormir ivormi-māli//*

Here also the king, who receives Aja, is compared with the ocean and the significance thereof is the same as noted above. But the suitor received is here compared with the moon. The reception has been painted by drawing a simile from the waters of the ocean swollen in the day of the full moon. The reference is to the natural phenomenon of high tide. The simile is, therefore, very natural, though this much is ■ pure fancy on the part of the poet that the water of the ocean swells to receive the moon in great delight. In Śrīharṣa's verse the suitor is compared with the stream of water coming from the Ganges. As rivers flow towards the sea and merge therein, the idea is very natural. But here also this much is ■ pure fancy that the ocean receives the flood of water coming from the Ganges with a two-sided rush of waves (*bhṛtā-bhīto-vīci-tatiḥ--prasārīta-bāhu-dvaya-sādṛśyārtham idanī viśeṣanam*—Siddhānta-vāgīśa).

For more affinity with *Raghu* V/61, see *Naiṣadhiya*, XX/2 :—

*tataḥ pratyudagād bhāmī kāntam āyāntam antikam/
pratīci-sindhu-vīcīva dīnoṅkāre sudhākaram//*

where Damayanti, going to receive Nala, has been compared with the waves of the western ocean and Nala with the moon at day-break.

The moonlight perturbing the ocean¹ has served a very beautiful simile in Canto III where Damayanti, attracting Nala by her merits, has been nicely compared with it —

*dhanyāsi vaidarbhi ' gunair udārair
yayā samakṛsyata naisadhō'pi/
itah stutih kā khalu candrikayā
yad abdhim apyuttaralīkaroti//*
(III/116)

“Damayanti, blessed art thou who hast attracted even Nala by thy noble virtues, after this, what praise is there for the light of the moon that it perturbs even the ocean ?”² The enchanting virtues of Damayanti have been nicely revealed by her comparison with the moonlight which delights everyone. So also the high personality of Nala has been fully reflected by his comparison with the ocean which is the most grave and vast object in Nature. It is a well known fact how the ocean water is perturbed at the time of flood tide. The simile drawn from this natural phenomenon, therefore, is a very fit one to express to what extent Damayanti was able to stir³

1 The reference is to the phenomenon of flood tide

2 Prof Handiqui

3 The verb *uttaralīkaroti* used with the *Upamana* as corresponding to *samakṛsyata* used with the *Upameya*, is very significant in suggesting the mental perturbation of Nala

the mind of even a person like Nala, the king of a great empire. This fact ultimately suggests the high merits (including womanly gracefulness) that Damayantī possessed which the swan, the speaker, actually wanted to point out as it was going on eulogising her.

Even saints and gods have not evaded the poetic vision of Śrīharṣa. The idea that Nala did not consider the loss of Damayantī a hindrance in carrying out his mission as a messenger of the gods, is presented thus :—

*bhaimyā samam nājgaṇad viyogaṁ
sa dūta-dharme sthiradhīr adhīśaḥ/
payodhi-pāne munir antarāyaṁ
durvāram apyaurvam ivaurvaśeyaḥ//
(VI/2)*

“Just as the sage Agastya did not consider even the irresistible Ocean-fire as an obstacle to his drinking up the ocean, similarly the firm-minded king did not consider the loss of Damayanī a hindrance in the path of carrying out his mission.”¹ It may be recalled that when Agastya was drinking up the ocean, the submarine fire became a great hindrance for him. Still the firm-minded sage was able to fulfil his determination. The comparison, therefore, has clearly indicated what a heavy task Nala had to perform, and consequently the magnanimity of his character is nicely reflected here.

1. Prof. Handiqui.

As regards similes drawn from gods, there are plenty of examples and the following verse is worth quoting —

*jagatī mithune cakrav eva smaragama paragau
navam va muthah sambhūñjate viyuṣya viyuṣya tau/
satatam amṛtad eva harād yad apad arocakam
tad amṛta bhujam bharta sambhur viṣam bubhūje
vibhuh//
(XIX/34)*

'The Cakravaka couple alone in the world is well versed in the art of love Parting and parting with each other mutually do they enjoy as new the pleasures of love Likewise the mighty Śiva the lord of the gods, swallowed poison because he was satiated with nectar, the self same food from day to day"¹ Here about the *Cakravaka* couple it is said that they part with each other at night² only to enjoy the pleasures of love anew, thus in the world they alone are skilled in the art of love They are hence compared with Lord Śiva who as the poet fancies satiated with nectar, swallowed venom to have the taste of nectar afresh The story of Śiva swallowing venom for protecting the Creation from extinction is well known But the poet gives here a new interpretation to it on which

1 Prof Handique

2 The *Cakravaka* couple is believed to part with each other at night Cf *cakravaka vahne amantehi sahaaram/ mātṛhi raani* (*Śakuntala* III, Eighth Edition by the late M R Kale Bombay 1957, p 118)

the comparison is based. This novelty of representation has made the simile more charming.

Again, while describing the yellow banners over the top-terraces of the city of Kuṇḍina with which the spot in the moon comes in contact (—so lofty the top-terraces are), a nice simile is drawn from Lord Kṛṣṇa dressed in yellow and lying on the serpent Śeṣa coiled up. The verse runs thus :—

*amṛta-dyuti-lakṣma pītayā
 militam yad-vaḍabhī-patākayā/
 valayāyita-śeṣa-sāyinaḥ
 sakhitām ādita pīta-vāsasaḥ//*
 (II/101)

“The spot in the moon coming in contact with the yellow flags over the turrets bore resemblance to the yellow-robed Kṛṣṇa lying on the coiled up serpent Ananta.”¹ Here the round white moon has been likened to the coiled up serpent Ananta. The point of similarity is that both are white and round—the one by its very nature and the other because it is coiled up. The stain of the moon bears similarity with Lord Kṛṣṇa—both being black. The fluttering banner coming in contact with the moon-stain bears semblance with the garment of Lord Kṛṣṇa—both being yellow. The point of similarity between the two pictures

1. Prof. Handique.

(used as *Upamana* and *Upameya* respectively) may seem to be a bit far-fetched from the ordinary point of view, but in poetic art this does not constitute a flaw. The idea is highly poetical and has got a charm of its own. There are plenty of such examples in our literature and they have been highly appreciated by critics¹. As a matter of fact, poetry and reality are not necessarily

1 Even in Kalidasa and other poets of high calibre there are many such beautiful ideas which seem to be far-fetched from the ordinary point of view. For instance, we may quote from the famous description of the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna in Canto XIII of the *Raghuvamśa*. The water of the Ganges is white and that of the Jumna is black. So, in describing their confluence Kalidasa draws a simile from the body of Lord Śiva and says that it appears like the body of Śiva decked in black serpents and besmeared with ashes used as cosmetics. The verse runs thus —

*kṛacī ca kṣṇoraga bhuṣaneṣa
bhasamangaragā tanur īśvarasya/
paśyanavadyangī vibhati ganga
bhinnā pravaha jamuna tarangāḥ//
(Raghu, XIII/57)*

Here also the comparison of the confluence of the two streams with the body of Lord Śiva is rather far-fetched from the ordinary point of view, firstly, because the water of the Jumna is certainly not so black as a serpent, secondly, even if it be admitted to be so, there is no conspicuous similarity of the confluence of the black and white streams with a body decked in black serpents and white ashes. Yet it is unanimously admitted that so far as the poetic fancy is concerned, the idea is highly appealing.

the same thing and the former should not be judged from the standpoint of the latter.

Objects used as standard of comparison are thus endless.

Mythical, religious, philosophical and other scholastic ideas.

Mythical, religious, philosophical concepts and ideas related to other sciences are also not wanting. In these cases Śrīharṣa's similes are most unconventional. The Indian poets have got a very natural tendency to borrow materials from the storehouse of mythology. The *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa is the most glaring instance in this respect. Śrīharṣa also had a good knowledge of Hindu mythology and the *Naiṣadhacarita* abounds in mythical accounts. A good number of beautiful similes have been drawn from the store of mythology. For instance, about the city of Kuṇḍina it is said :—

vitataṁ vaṇijāpaṇe 'kṣilam
paṇitum yatra janena vīkṣyate/
mnineva mṛkaṇḍa-sūnuna
jagatām vastu purodare hareḥ/
(II/91)

"As formerly the sage Markaṇḍeya saw inside the stomach of Viṣṇu the objects of the universe, similarly people saw in the city articles of every

description exposed for sale by each merchant in his shop'.¹ The allusion is to the Puranic account² that at the time of the Deluge (*Pralaya*) the sage Markandeya entered into the stomach of Lord Hari where he saw the entire universe exactly in the same form as it had been outside before the Deluge. Since the purpose of the poet is to tell us that in the city of Kundina there were all sorts of objects the comparison of the entire universe inside the stomach of Viṣṇu has been very appropriate.

Again while undergoing the pangs of separation (elaborately described in Canto IV) Dama-yanti asks her friend to ask Rāhu why he has spared the moon which is tormenting her so bitterly in this stage of separation.³ A simile

1 Prof Handique

2 Narrated in the *Brahma purana* Chs 52-54 and in the *Mahabharata*, *Vana parvan*, Ch 188. This myth has also been referred to in N.C., XXI/94 (*īastu viśvam udare tava dṛṣṭva* etc.)

3 There is a poetic convention that the moon enhances the agony of separated lovers. Cf. *bhagavan kusumayudha! tvaṃ ca candramasā ca viśvasanjabhyam atisandhiyate kamī kṛna-sāritah! kutah!*

*tava kusuma śaratām śita rasmitām indor
dīpām idam ayathārtham dṛṣyate mad vidheṣu/
viśṛjati hūma garbhair agnum indur mavukṛhais
tvām apī kusuma banan vajrasarikaroṣi//*

(*Śakuntala* III/3)

has there been drawn from a legend about Garuḍa.¹
The verse is as follows :—

*dahati kaṇṭham ayaṁ khalu tena kiṁ
garuḍavad dvija-vāsanayojjhitaḥ/
prakṛtir asya vidhantuda ! dāhikā
mayi mirāgasi kū vada vipratā//*
(IV/71)

“Has Rāhu, like Garuḍa, spared the moon, being under the impression that it was a Brāhmaṇa, because it burnt his throat? Rāhu, to burn is the nature of the moon; tell me, what Brāhmaṇa quality it has in the case of one innocent like me.”² The allusion is to the story that, on one occasion Garuḍa was devouring the *Niṣāda*³ when he mistook a Brahmin for a *Niṣāda* and, while devouring him, felt a burning sensation in his throat. Thereby he could know that the man was a Brahmin and set him free. The significance of the allusion is that it has justified

Also, pādān indor amṛta-śiśirāṇ jāla-mārga-praviṣṭān
pūrva-prītyā gatam abhimukhaṇ sannivṛttaṇ tathaiva/
(Meghadūta, II/30/A-B).

1. Related in the *Mahābhārata*, *Ādi-parvan*, Chs. 28-29; and in the *Padma-purāṇa*, *Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*, Ch. 49.

2. Prof. Handiqui.

3. *Niṣāda* is the ‘name of one of the wild aboriginal tribes in India, such as hunters, fishermen etc.’ (Prof. V. S. Apte’s *Skt.—Eng. Dictionary*.)

the act of Rāhu, namely, sparing the cruel moon. Rāhu ought to have devoured the moon and thus saved the pitiable girl Damayantī. But he has not been able to do so, because while swallowing the moon he has felt a burning sensation in his throat, and apprehending the victim to be a Brahmin he has left him,—as did Garuda when he came to know his victim to be a Brahmin. The simile drawn from the Garuda legend has thus saved Rāhu from the charge of being unsympathetic to Damayantī. But in the second half of the verse Damayantī points out that Rāhu has mistaken the moon for a Brahmin. The burning sensation that he felt in his throat was not due to the fact that the victim was a Brahmin as was the case with Garuda, but due to the fact that to burn is the very nature of the victim. Not only has it burnt the throat of Rāhu, but is burning all along the heart of the innocent girl Damayantī which no Brahmin can ever do.¹

1. Māgha also has drawn a simile from this story when he says about the camels of the army of Lord Kṛṣṇa stationed in mount Raivataka :—

*sārdhaṃ kathaṃcīd ucītaṃ picumārda-patrātr
asyāntarāla-gatam āmra-dalaṃ mradīyah/
dāserakaḥ sapadī saṃvalitaṃ niṣādau
vipram purā patagarād va nirjagāra||*

(Śiśupālavadha, V/66)

It may be pointed out that the simile drawn by Māgha is not a very happy one. It has been said here that, while

Again, in Canto XVII, while rebuking the spokesman of the group of heretics (Lust, Wrath, Greed and Delusion) who has decried in extremely harsh words the religious beliefs of the Āryas, Agni gives utterance to these words drawing a simile from the episode of the Sun and the Mandechas :—

putreṣṭi-śyena-kārī-
mukhā drṣṭa-phalā makhāḥ/
na vaḥ kiṁ dharma-sandeha-
mandeha-jaya-bhānavah/
 (XVII/93)

“Are not the sacrifices with visible results the suns of victory over those Mandeha demons, your own doubts about religion—sacrifices for the birth of children, destruction of enemies, and coming of rain ?”¹ The demons called Mandehas are three and a half crore in number. In the morning twilight

devouring the leafage of *Picumarda* (*Melia azadirachta*), a camel took a mango-leaf unawares. As soon as it had been detected (from its sweet taste) it emitted the same, just as Garuḍa emitted the Brahmin whom he mistook for a *Niṣāda*. But the Brahmin burnt the throat of Garuḍa and thus revealed his real nature, whereas the mango-leaf did not cause any burning sensation in the throat of the camel ; it was detected from its sweet taste. So the semblance is not very clear here. The simile used by Śrīharṣa, on the other hand, does not suffer from this defect. On the contrary, as pointed out above, it is very significant and appropriate to the context.

1. Prof. Handiqui. Read *et cetera* (for *mukha*) in the end.

they attack the Sun to devour him, but are ultimately vanquished by the latter. There are scriptural injunctions of making sacred offerings thrice with the divine *Gayatri* metre to the Sun before he rises in the eastern horizon. This weakens the demons and makes the Sun victorious¹. The religious doubts of the heretics have here been likened to the Mandeha demons and the sacrifices with visible results have been likened to the Sun. What Agni means to say is this. As the Sun overcomes the Mandehas by dint of his strength so also the sacrifices, by means of their visible results (i.e., the birth of a child etc.)² ought to have overcome the doubts of the heretics about religion. But unfortunately, the speaker regrets, they are not doing so. The comparison of their religious doubts with the Mandehas is a very clear expression of the contempt of the speaker for the heretics, inasmuch as it hints at their demonic nature. The comparison of the sacrifices with

1 The story of the Mandehas is referred to in the *Tattvārīya Āraṇyaka*, 2/2 (*raksamsi ha va puronurake tapogam atishhanta* etc.), and in the *Skanda purana Kasi khaṇḍa* (*Purvardha*), 35/vs 152-155.

This myth has also been referred to in N.C., XIX/41 (*jad at mahati bhaktir bhavanau* etc.)

2 The result of *Putreshti* is the birth of a child, the result of *Śyena* is the annihilation of enemies and that of *Kariri* is the coming of rain. When these sacrifices are performed, the respective results are obtained in this world within a short time. Hence they have been called *dr̥ṣṭa phala makhaḥ*.

the Sun, on the other hand, shows that the religious doubts of the heretics are simply fruitless ; they cannot prove the sacrifices as futile. Can anything on earth subdue the lustre of the self-luminous sun ? It is rather strange, as the speaker says, that the religious doubts of the heretics still exist and are not being completely removed by the visible fruits of the sacrifices, unlike the Mandehas who are totally defeated by the Sun.¹

Let us now come to the similes drawn from the religious field. Religion has from time out of mind exerted a great influence on the Indian mind. In the writings of our poets and litterateurs also religious ideas are profusely scattered. Śrī-harṣa is no exception in this respect. Not only are there references to the *Vedas*, *Dharmaśāstra*, *Smṛti*, the authors of *Dharmaśāstra* like Manu etc., and various religious injunctions, but similes drawn from the field of religion also are not wanting. Thus about the nature of Delusion (*Moha*), which is the root of Wrath, Greed and Lust, it is said :—

brahmacāri-vratasthāyi-
yatayo gr̥hiṇāṃ yathā!
trayo yam upajīvanti
krodha-lobha-manobhavāḥ!
 (XVII/32)

1. See another good example of simile from mythical idea under *Rhetorical devices*.

"On him depend Wrath, Greed and Cupid, all three, just as religious students, recluses and ascetics depend on the householder for their living"¹ The reference is to the *Āsrama-dharma*. Our *Dharmaśāstras* enjoin four stages of life to be undergone by a Brahmin. These are—*Brahmacarya*, *Gṛhasthya*, *Vānaprastha* and *Bhikṣa* or *Sannyāsa* (*Kṣattriyas* and *Vaiśyas* can enter upon the first three stages while, according to some other authorities the fourth stage is also open to them). Individuals entering upon these stages are respectively known as *Brahmacārīn*, *Gṛhastha* (*Grhin*), *Vānaprastha* (*Vratasthāyin*) and *Bhikṣu* or *Sannyāsin* (*Yati*). Manu assigns the highest status to the *Gṛhastha* inasmuch as those belonging to other orders (*Āśramins*) have to depend on him for their livelihood². And this has served

1 Prof Handique

2 *yasmāt trayo 'pyāśramino*
jñānenannena canvaḥam|
gṛhasthenaiṣa dharyante
tasmaj jyeṣṭhasramo gṛhi||
(Manu smṛti, III/78)

sarveṣam apī caitēṣāṃ
veda smṛti vidhanataḥ|
gṛhastha ucyaṭe śreṣṭhah
sa itṛiṇ etan vibharti hi||
yati a nadī nadāḥ sarve
sagare yanti samsthitum|
tathaiṣāśraminah sarve
gṛhasthe yanti samsthitum||
(Manu smṛti, VI/89-90)

our poet with a simile. He compares the dependence of Wrath (*Krodha*), Greed (*Lobha*) and Cupid (*Manobhava*) on Delusion (*Moha*) with that of religious students (*Brahmacārin*), recluses (*Vratasthāyin*) and ascetics (*Yatī*) on the householder (*Gṛhin*). Though scholastic, being drawn from the field of religion and having a reference to the statements of Manu, the simile is very simple and distinct.¹

As another such example of simple simile drawn from the religious field, the following verse is worth quoting :—

kareṇa vāñcheva vidhuṃ vidhartuṃ
yam ittham ātthādariṇī taṃ artham/
pātum śrutibhyāṃ api nādhikurve
varṇaṃ śruter varṇa ivāntimalḥ kim/
 (III/62)

"The matter of which thou thus speakest with fervour as something like a desire to catch the moon with the hands—have I no right even to hear of it, just as a Śūdra has no right to hear the words of the Vedas?"² This is an answer of the swan to Damayanti's words that she is unable to express her desire (i.e., of getting Nala as her husband) which her mind can never part with ; it will be like the expression of the desire

1. For another simile drawn from the same idea see N.C., VI/97 (*varṣeṣu yad bhāratam ārya-dhuryāh* etc.)

2. Prof. Handiqui.

of an impudent girl to catch the moon with the hands¹ The swan in its regretful reply, draws a simile from the scriptural interdiction that a Śudra (one belonging to the last of the four classes of the Aryans) has no right to hear the words of the Vedas² The speaker's purpose of using such a simile is simply to gain the sympathy of Damayanti so that she may not put the swan in the rank of a Śudra and may frankly express her desire to it³

The same skill is noticed in using philosophical ideas Śrīharsa was an erudite scholar and had a thorough knowledge of all the systems of Indian philosophy His *Khandana khanda khadya* occupies a high place among the treatises in the field of philosophy There are ample references to these systems and their tenets in his poem and apt similes have been drawn therefrom For instance in Canto IX when Nala discloses his identity to Damayanti and then realising his fault begins to reproach himself the poet says —

*mumir yathatmanam atha prabodhavan
prakaśayantam svam asav abudhyata/*

1 Vide N C III/59 (*manas tu yam nojjhati jatu yatu etc*)

2 *stri sudra dvija bandhunam trayi na sruti gōcara/* (Bhagavata I/4/25[A B])

N B This is of course the orthodox view

3 For another use of Śāstric injunction (Gautama's *Dharmasūtras* I/5/16-17) in a simile see under *Erotic ideas*

*api prapannāṁ prakṛtiṁ vilokya tām
avūpta-saṁskāratayāsrjad girāḥ||*
(IX/120)

"Then coming to his senses, he became conscious that he was disclosing his identity ; and, seeing Damayanti coming to herself, he spoke these words, having recollected his past ; just as a sage, on attaining right knowledge, becomes conscious of the soul revealing itself, and just as he, seeing the Cosmic Matter near at hand, makes (relevant) utterances, having recollected the impressions of his past lives."¹ The reference is to the Vedantic theory of *Mokṣa* or Emancipation. At that stage the knowledge of the self-evident Soul emerges and consciousness is rightly understood to be different from *Prakṛti* or the Primordial Matter. The relevant utterances of the person realising the Self (*Muni* i.e., *Brahmavid*), viz., 'such and such were the functions of this *Prakṛti* in the previous births', are, however, based on the recollection of the past. This idea has served our poet with a grand simile. He compares Nala with the Self-knowing sage and superimposes on his behaviour that of the *Brahmavid*.²

1. Prof. Handique.

2. Cāṇḍīpañḍita interprets the verse thus :—

"*asau nalo 'tha paścāt prakṛṣṭa-bodha-yukto mohavinaśe sati ātmānaṁ svaṁ nalatvaṁ prakāśayantam abudhyata, mayā udbhrāntya dūta-dharmo nāśita iti nalo 'jānāt|*

Some may criticise a verse like this as being meant simply for the exhibition of scholarship¹ and as lacking real poetic charm. We, however, do not find any ground for such criticism. Poetry is for all. As an ordinary reader may expect here

*tataś cāṇḍa-saṁskārataḥ pūṇa-saṁskārena tām ātmanah
prakṛtiṁ svābhāvikīm avasthāṁ prapannāṁ prāptāṁ vilokya
giro vānīḥ asṛjat uvāca/ nalah ka va/ yathā munīḥ brahman
aneka-janmarjita-nityāgnihoṭrādi-karmābhyaśena / pratyavāya-pari-
hārena kamya-niśiddha-karma-parityāgena ca nūtanā-karmābhāvāt
antah-karana-śuddhyā bhogena vartamāna-dehārambha-prārabdha-
śubhāśubham kṣapayitvā sama-damādi-sādhana-catuṣṭaya-saṁpa-
tityā śāstrācārya-prasādāt prakṛṣṭa-bodha-yukto bhrahma-jñānavān
ātmānam sva-prakāśam nitya-śuddha-buddha-mukta-svābhāvam
budhyate/ sraṇa-manana-nididhyāsanāt aham bhrahmāsmi pra
tipadyate/ tathā janmāntarīya-samskarābhyaśena ca tām prasid-
dhaṁ prakṛtiṁ sattva-rajas-tamasām sāmavasthām mayām anūdām
avidyāṁ prapannām pṛthag-bhūtaṁ vilokya “aham manur abhāvam
sūryas cāham lakṣmīṁ ṛṣir asmi viprah/ aham kutsam drjuneyam
nyṛṇje ‘ham kavir uśanā paśyatā ma” (Rgveda, IV/26/1) ityā-
dika rgveda-prasiddhā pcah vāmadevaṛṣi (the Seer of the above
hymn)-vat muktaḥ san paśyan vadati/ aha ca tām prapannām
prakṛtiṁ vilokyaṇi prabodhe ‘pi saṁskārānuṣṭiteḥ mūdhavad
eva giro ‘sṛjat pūṇavāc eva kanicit vacanasyuvāca/ jīvan-mukto
‘pi prakṛti-piṇḍa-bheda-jñāne ‘pi pūṇa-saṁskāra-vāśāt buddhi-
karmendriya-vyūpāraṇ karoti/ girām sarjanam indriya-vyāpā-
ropalākṣanam/ tadā ca “aye mayātmety” ārabhya śloka-pañca-
kṣya nala-vākyatām / itī svayam moha-mahormi-nimittam
prakāśanam śocatītyanenakṣiptam ityapi vyākhyāntaram/ upamā
anuprāsa-śleṣān-api”*

(Extracted after necessary corrections from MS no 16 of 1874-75 of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona)

1. Cf *nāṣadhām vācādhadhām*

an easy reading and a quick access to the meaning, so also a scholar may expect here something which will be congenial to his scholarly mind. If, therefore, the poet inserts 'occasionally'¹ such scholarly ideas in his poem, there is nothing to object to. Śrīharṣa himself has frankly admitted at the end of his poem that he has intentionally done so :—

*grantha-granthir iha kvacit kvacid api
nyāsi prayatnān mayā
prājñānmanyamanā haṭhena paṭhitī
māsmīn khalaḥ khelatuḥ
śraddhārāddha-guru-ślatīkṛta-drḍha-
granthiḥ samāsādayatv-
etat-kāvya-rasormi-majjana-sukha-
vyāsajjanam saj-janaḥ//*
(XXII/154)

Even in Kālidāsa we come across high philosophical ideas.² 'Moreover, we do not think that

1. Cf. *kvacit kvacid api* in N.C., XXII/154 (quoted here).

2. Cf. *Śākuntala*, V/2 (*ramyāṇi vikṣya madhurāṇi ca niśamya śabdān* etc.) where there is a reference to the theory of the transmigration of Soul ; *Raghuvamśa*, XIII/60 (*payodharaiḥ puṇya-janāṅganānām* etc.) where in the last line (*buddher ivāvyaktam udāharantī*) a simile has been drawn from the *Sāṅkhya* theory of Evolution. The opening verses of all the three dramas of Kālidāsa contain references to philosophical tenets, such as, Omnipresence of God, Emancipation, Renunciation (of *Vedānta*), word inhering in Ether (of *Nyāya*), and so on. Illustrations may be multiplied.

the use of the philosophical idea has marred the poetic charm. Though the idea is highly philosophical, the simile has been quite natural and one hardly feels that the comparison has gone against the intrinsic poetic spirit of the verse.

To note a similar such example of 'knot of the poem' (*grantha granthi*) let us take up the following verse where an apt simile has been drawn from the theory of self validity or *Svatah prāmānya* of *Mīmāṃsā*. Nala asks the swan to stretch its helping hand to him so that he may get united with Damayanti, but immediately he thinks that it is redundant to make this request to the swan, because the benevolence of the good natured ones does not depend on others request but proceeds from their own inclination, and says —

*athavā bhavataḥ pravartana
na katham piṣṭam iyaṁ piṇaśī naḥ/
svata eva satām parārthatā
grahanānam hi yathā yathārthatā//*
(II/61)

"Or, perhaps, urging thee to action is like crushing a thing already crushed,¹ for the good do good to others of their own accord, just as sense-perceptions become valid on their own account."² The *Mīmāṃsā* view is that the validity (*yathārthatā*) of knowledge does not depend

1 i.e. needless (*piṣṭa pesana*)

2 Prof Handique

on any other source of knowledge, but is inherent in the knowledge itself (*svata eva*). If the cognition of an object has to depend on another knowledge for the validity of its source, then the latter will have to depend on a third cognition for its own validity; that, again, will have to depend on a fourth cognition for the same purpose and the series will thus come to no end, i.e., there will be a fallacy known as *Anavasthā* ('absence of finality or conclusion'). This is why the *Mīmāṃsakas* admit the self-validity of knowledge. It has been discussed by Professor Krishna Kanta Handiqui, who takes the word *yathārtha* to mean 'true', that there is a reference in this verse to the *Prabhākara* view that all cognitions are true, because they are cognitions, and there is no error as such.¹ This tenet of the *Mīmāṃsakas* has been

1. See 'Naiṣadhacarita of Śrīharṣa' by Prof. K. K. Handiqui, 2nd Edition, Poona, 1956; Appendix I, p. 519.

Cāṇḍūpanḍita interprets the verse thus :—

"*athavā tyāṇi bhavataḥ no 'smākaṇ pravartanā katharṇ
plṣṭarṇ na plnaṣṭi| yad ahaṇi bhavantarṇ pravartayāmi tat vṛthā
plṣṭa-peṣaṇam eva| hi yasmāt satārṇ mahātmanāṇi svata eva
para-preraṇarṇ vinā parārthatā para-kārya-kartṛtvam| yathā
grahaṇānāṇi jñānānāṇi pramāṇānāṇi yathārthatā satyatā prā-
māṇyarṇ svata eva| yad āha—svataḥ sarva-pramāṇānāṇi prā-
māṇyam iha gṛhyatām| na hi svato 'satī śaktiḥ kartum anyena
śakyate|| iti| anjumanāṇi ca sarve pratyayāḥ yathārthāḥ pra-
tyayatvāt| ghaṭa-pratyayavat| athavā gṛhyante ghaṭa-paṭḍayaḥ
padārthā ebhir iti grahaṇānindriyāṇi teṣāṇi svata eva yathār-
thatā viśaya-grahaṇarṇ na tu para-preraṇayā| athavā grahaṇā-
nāṇi jñānānāṇi yathā yathārthatā svata eva sva-prakāśatvarṇ
jñānānāṇi yathetyarthāḥ| āthavā grahaṇānāṇi śabdānāṇi yathā*

nicely used by our poet for his poetic purpose. As the validity of cognitions is inherent in them and does not depend on any other source of knowledge, so also the benevolence of the good is inherent in their very nature and does not proceed from other's request. This explains very well the case of Nala that it is needless to request the swan to help him when its very nature is good. Verses of this type show how highly philosophical ideas can be well fitted in poetic compositions. The main idea here is not at all obscured, and as such there is no touch of artificiality.

Similes have been drawn from other systems of philosophy also. Thus in XVII/78, when the spokesman of heretics denounces all philosophical tenets as baseless owing to the unstable character of all reasons, he draws a simile from the fallacy known as *Sat pratipaksa* ('counterbalanced cause') admitted by the *Naiyāyikas*, which consists in an argument which is inconclusive owing to the counterbalance of a contrary argument of equal weight. The spokesman says —

*tarkāpratisthayaḥ saṁśad
anyonyasya vyatighnatam/
nāprāmāṇyam matanam syat
kesam sat pratipaksavat//*

*yatharthata vacakatvam svata eva pravṛttatvat/ anuprasa nīdar-
sana kavyalingam upamāḥ"*

(Extracted from MS No 16 of 1874-75 of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona)

"Owing to the unstable character of all reasoning, is there any whose opinions, mutually opposed, being equal in force, will not be baseless ; like 'a fallacious inference with a contradictory reason on the opposite side'?"¹ The simile has got a definite purpose. The speaker wants to refute the philosophical tenets. In order to do that he shows the instance of *Sat-pratipakṣa*. As the fallacy of *Sat-pratipakṣa* is admitted by the *Naiyāyikas* themselves and is not an innovation of the heretics, the purpose of the speaker has been rightly served. When one refutes another's contentions by following the latter's own line of argument, the refutation stands on a more firm ground.²

There are also references to the *Vaiśeṣika* doctrine of Atom. In Canto III the swan tells Damayantī :—

*anyonya-saṅgama-vaśād adhunā vibhātām
tasyāpi te 'pi manasī vikaśad-vilāse/
sraṣṭum punar manasijasya tanuṃ pravṛttam
ādāv iva dvyaṇuka-kṛt paramāṇu-yugmam//*
(III/125)

"By virtue of your mutual union, let now your minds, thine and Nala's, shine forth, blossoming with joys, as if they were two atoms forming first a unit of two atoms, about to create once more the

1. Prof. Handiqui.

2. Of course, whether the argument of the heretics finally stands or not is quite a different question.

body of the mind-born god of love"¹ The swan says that the minds of Nala and Damayantī, by mutual union, may again form the body of Cupid, who was formerly reduced to ashes by Lord Śiva, and as an *Upamāna* of this it refers to two atoms forming a *Dvyanuka* in the first stage of the process of atomic creation. This external world is, according to the *Vaiśeṣika* theory, created by the combination of atoms. But Cupid being born of mind (*Manasiya*), he can be created only by the combination of minds serving as atoms. (It is to indicate this that the poet uses the term *manasiya* and not *madana* or *kāma*.) In the process of atomic creation the first stage is the combination of two atoms forming a *Dvyanuka*. Similarly, in the creation of Cupid the first stage will be the union of the minds of Nala and Damayantī. Now, Cupid is the god of love. And as Nala and Damayantī are in deep love with each other, their minds are quite fit to serve as the first constituents in the creation of Cupid. The simile, it cannot be denied is a very fit one, and though the idea of Cupid and his relation to human mind is very common in classical Sanskrit literature, the whole idea, viz., the creation of Cupid as compared with the atomic creation of the *Vaiśeṣika* philosophy, is quite unconventional in the realm of Sanskrit literature.²

1 Prof Handique

2 A number of *Luptopamas* (where the *Upamāna* and the *Upameya* have been compounded and the point of similarity has been dropped) have also been used with reference to atoms (*Paramanu*, *Dvyanuka*, etc). Cf. *dvyanukodari* in IV/3 as

So far as the *Sāṃkhya* and the *Yoga* are concerned, there are a few references to the doctrines of these systems. In XXII/76¹ where Damayantī describes the orb of the moon by drawing a simile from the sacrifice (*Ijyā*) and says, with reference to its stain, that the stain of the fair moon is its only foul portion, just as the killing of animals is the only impure aspect of the pure sacrifice, commentators find a reference to the *Sāṃkhya* view, that the slaughter of animals in sacrifices is blamable.²

In VI/46, where the wonderful phenomenon of Nala being invisible and moving about in the inner apartments of the royal palace of Kuṇḍina is described, a simile has been drawn from the *Yogin* and his superhuman power of assuming different forms. The verse runs thus :—

*bhavan-nadṛśyaḥ pratibimba-deha-
vyūhaṃ vitanvan maṇi-kuṭṭimeṣu/
puraṃ parasya praviśan viyogī
yogīva citraṃ sa rarāja rājā//*

qualifying Damayantī ; *paramāṇu-madhyāḥ* in III/41 as qualifying the ladies in the harem of Nala. These are the peculiar expressions of Śrīharṣa. They are novel, yet simple and, therefore, have got a special charm of their own.

1. *ijyeva deva-vraja-bhojya-ṛddhiḥ
śuddhā sudhā-didhiti-maṇḍaliyam/
hiraṇyā yathā saiva tathāṅgam eṣā
kalāṅkam ekaṃ malinaṃ bibharti//*
2. See the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, verse 2 :—
*dṛṣṭavad ānuśravikaḥ
sa hyaviśuddhi-kṣayātīśaya-yuktaḥ/
tad-viparītaḥ śreyān
vyaktāvyakta-jñā-vijñānāt//*

"It was wonderful that the forlorn king by becoming invisible, by spreading out a series of bodies in the shape of his reflections on the bejewelled floors and by entering the upper story of another's mansion, shone like an ascetic (who also becomes invisible at will, assumes a plurality of bodies and enters the body of another) "¹ As a *Yogin*, owing to his mystic powers, can remain invisible whenever he likes so also was Nala by the boon of the gods,² as a *Yogin* can assume a plurality of bodies, so also did Nala by the series of reflections on the bejewelled floors as a *Yogin* can enter the body (*pura*) of another, so also did Nala enter another apartment (*pura*), and as a *Yogin* is *viyogin* (detached from all wordly pleasures), so also was Nala a *viyogin* (a separate lover) So comments Narāyana *munir api adśyo bhavati, kāya-vyūhaṇ ca karoti, parasya jīvāntarasya sarīraṇ ca pravṛṣati viśayebhyo nivr̥ttatād viyogi ca bhavati* The simile is thus very clear and apt There is another point to note here The king has been said to be *viyogin* (separated), and when he is presented as a *Yogin* also, which literally means 'united, an 'apparent contradiction' (*Virodhābhāsa*) is implied³

1 Prof Handique

2 *bhuyad antardhū siddher anuvihita bhavac cittata jatra tatra*] (N C, V/137/D)

3 The poet has deliberately used the word *viyogi* only to imply this apparent contradiction Cf *viyogi sa raja nalah yogi sa vijoga rahita na, aha ca munir iva viraraja etac citram vrahuno vrahitvābhavad āścaryam*] (Narayana)

In VI/4 also, where about Nala's arrival at the city of Kuṇḍina it is said,—Nala's chariot reached that city in a moment, just as a desire attains fulfilment in a moment (*manorathāḥ siddhim iva kṣaṇena rathas tadīyaḥ puram āsasāda*),—commentators find a reference to the *Yogin* who can fulfil his desire in a moment.¹ The significance of the comparison with a *Yogin's* desire is to suggest the high speed of the chariot.²

Instances are thus numerous. Of course there are a few verses where reference to different philosophical tenets has obscured the main idea,³

For other examples of apparent contradiction blended with simile, see under *Rhetorical devices*.

1. Cf. *sādhāraṇa-manorathasya kṣaṇena siddhi-lābhā-sambhavād atra manoratha-padam yogi-manoratha-param*/
(*Siddhānta-vāgīśa*.)

2. Cf. *manoratha-dṛṣṭāntena rathasyātījavanatvam sūcitam*/
(*Nārāyaṇa*.)

3. Cf. *yā soma-siddhānta-mayānaneva
śūnyātmatā-vāda-mayodareva/
vijñāna-sāmastya-mayāntareva
sākāratā-siddhi-mayākhileva*//

(X/88)

In each foot of this verse a philosophical doctrine is referred to. The poet fancies the face of Damayantī as the doctrines of the Kāpālikas (*Soma-siddhānta*), her belly as the doctrine of Nihilism (*Śūnyātmatā-vāda*), her heart as the doctrine of Universal Consciousness (*Vijñāna-sāmastya*) and finally her whole frame as the doctrine of sense-knowledge being endowed with form (*Sākāratā-siddhi*). (The last three are the doctrines of the different sects of the Buddhists, viz., the *Mādhyamikas*, the *Yogācāryas* and the *Sautrāntikas*.) But this makes the verse apparently nonsensical unless a commentator comes forward and throws light on the real meaning. We are, therefore, unwilling to accept such a verse as an apt example of Śrīharṣa's simile.

yet, leaving out these few exceptions, the instances are appealing from the literary point of view. Literature and philosophy go hand in hand and the *Naisadhacarita* is a living example of this truth.

Similes from other sciences also are not wanting. The poet draws new types of simile from the field of grammar (XI/115—*sājuyam recchati bhavasya bhavābdu yadaḥ* etc., XVII/150—*gati-antarā naḥ bhāṣmān* etc.), poetics (XIII/53—*itarānala-tula bhāg esu sesaḥ sudhabhūḥ* etc.), dramaturgy (IX/118—*na vartase manmatha-natīkā kathā* etc.) the science of medicine (IV/2—*yad aṭanu yara bhūḥ tanute sma sā* etc.) the science of archery (III/126-127—*kamaḥ kausuma-capa durjayam amum* etc. and *tvad guccāvali mauktikūṇi gulīkāḥ* etc.), chemistry (IX/42—*anugrahaḥ eva divaukasām naraḥ* etc.), botany (VIII/90—*ekaikam ete parirabhya pīna* etc., XII/96—*asyāsir bhujagah śakosa vīvarākṛṣṭaḥ* etc.), the science of birds (XVII/213—*udbhūḥ viracitāvasaḥ* etc.), the art of navigation (XXII/99—*dināvasāne taraner akasmāt* etc.) and so on. These similes are all scholastic, but not in the least incomprehensible and they have aptly fitted in the poem.

XI/115 relates the glory of Vārāṇasī by saying that the creatures of the ocean of this world (*bhavābdu*) are identified with Lord Śiva by coming to this holy city, just as the root *as* is identified (in its application) with the root *bhū* in the aorist mood (Cf. *abhūt* from the root *as* or *bhū*). Evidently, the reference is to the grammatical aphorism *aster*

bhūh.¹ But the simile is clear and simple and does not, therefore, impede the aesthetic appreciation of the verse.

In XVII/150² Indra tells Kali that it is not possible for him (Kali) to get into possession of Nala and Damayantī, just as the letter *ḍ* cannot enter into the combination of letters forming the word *ṣaṇṇām* when the stem and the affix are kept disjoined. The reference is to the grammatical provision that the final *ṣ* of the stem *ṣaṣ* turns into *ḍ* in combination with the affix *nām* (*ām*) by the rule *jhalām jaśo 'nte*.³ The simile is highly scholastic, but very apt as it evidently suggests how impossible it is for Kali to get into possession of Nala and Damayantī.⁴

XIII/53 is also a good example of unconventional simile drawn from a poetic figure, viz., *Anuprāsa* (alliteration) wherein, in spite of the similarity of letters between the first and the last words, the real charm flashes out of the last letter. The last two words of the verse, viz., *anuprāsa-bhāsām vilasaḥ*, serve as an example of this.

1. *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, II/4/52.

2. Some commentators think this verse to be an interpolation; but as early commentators like Cāṇḍupāṇḍita and Vidyādhara explain it, we have referred to it as a genuine one.

3. *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, VIII/2/39. This *ḍ*, in its turn, turns into *ṇ* by the *Vārttika*—*pratyaye bhāṣāyām nityam* (read under *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, VIII/4/45) and assimilates the following *n* by the rule *ṣṭunā ṣṭuḥ* (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*, VIII/4/41).

4. See also *N.C.*, III/23 (*kriyeta cet sādhu-vibhakti-cintā* etc.) where a grammatical idea is suggested by means of *double entendre*.

Here, of the three dental sibilant¹ sounds (s's) contained in the expression, the grace of alliteration is due mainly to the last one. Similarly thinks Damayantī though there are five persons before her—all bearing the appearance of Nala—it is the last one that washes her heart with streams of ambrosia. The simile beautifully points out the characteristic charm of an alliteration the example of which is supplied by the verse itself. The superexcellent charm of the real Nala is thereby nicely suggested here. It is the novelty of this simile that strikes us most.

In IX/118 Nala fancies Damayantī to be Cupid's drama (*Manmatha nāṭikā*) personified, where the *Sūtradhara* (stage manager), *Nayaka* (hero), *Dvijarad Vidūsaka* (Brahmin jester), *Anga hāra* (graceful gestures)—that are generally found in a drama—are all there, the words being equally applicable to Damayantī in a different sense¹. Though the metaphor is based on ingenious word play,² the idea is not obscured

1 Thus, *prakāṣa romavalī sutra dharinī*, as qualifying Damayantī, means 'holding the string in the form of the visible line of hair in the body', *nayaka* primarily means the 'central gem', *angahara* means the 'necklace', *dvijarad vidūsakah*, primarily an adjective to *śukha manih*, means 'defeating the moon (in brightness)'. For the complete verse and its translation, see Sec. V.

2 As a matter of fact ingenious play on words does not necessarily impede poetic beauty unless it goes too far. This will be subsequently discussed at length.

thereby—so prominent the words are and so uniquely the poet uses them.

In IV/2 it is metaphorically said that suffering from Cupid's fever (*Atanu-jvara*) Damayantī plunged into the pond of the story of her beloved ; but its effect was injurious to her, as it caused for a long time a burning sensation in her heart. The idea is that the story of her beloved, related by the swan-messenger, enhanced the mental agony of the lovelorn girl. The metaphor has a reference to medical science according to which a feverish person bathing in a pool is attacked by typhoid fever. The comparison of love's agony with the morbid heat of fever is very conventional,, but the whole idea, i.e., the comparison of Damayantī listening to the story of Nala and getting her heart perturbed thereby with a feverish person plunging into a pool and falling prey to typhoid, is Śrīharṣa's own, and its aptness surpasses any question.

III/126 and 127 reveal Śrīharṣa's knowledge of the science of archery. Complicated metaphors have here been drawn from the bow, its target and application. The description of Damayantī as Cupid's bow makes the erotic idea more impressive, while the description itself is very vivid and picturesque. It is said there that Cupid found Nala not to be conquered with a bow of flowers and was, therefore, glad to find in Damayantī, who belonged to a pure family (*avraṇa-vamśa-jā*) and possessed great virtues (*adhi-guṇā*), a bow made of flawless bamboo (*avraṇa-vamśa-jā*), and

equipped with string (*adhi gunā*) Damayanti was shining with a piece of silken strip, beautiful with vermilion mark, which, hanging down a little on her back, decorated her neck like a line left (by gold) on a touchstone. This has been fancied as the mark of vermilion rubbed by Cupid on the back of the bamboo in order to test its soundness. Further, the pearls of the necklace of Damayanti, the beautiful bow of Cupid, have been described as the shots of Cupid's bow, Nala as a flamingo which happened to be the target of the shots, the line of hair on the body of Damayanti as the string of Cupid's bow, and her gleaming navel as the hole in the centre of the bowstring (provided for holding the shots).

In IX/42 Nala makes it clear to Damayanti that by marrying one of the gods she will attain divinity through the divine grace and thus she will no longer fall under the category of mortals. He supports his argument by drawing a similar instance from the science of chemistry. When specially prepared mercury transmutes iron into gold, it can no longer be included under the category of iron.¹

1 The reference is actually to alchemy or *Dhātuvīdyā* to which our poet refers in XVII/79 —

*akrodham śikṣayantyānyan krodhana ye tapodhanah|
nirdhanas te dhanavaiṣa dhātuvīdyopadeśinah||*

In the Middle Ages alchemy was regarded as a science. It aimed at the production of (1) the philosopher's stone for transmuting baser metals into gold, (2) the elixir for prolongation of life indefinitely and (3) the universal solvent. There were many noted alchemists like Paracelsus, Albertus Magnus,

The comparison here is of Damayantī, turning into a goddess through the grace of the gods, with a piece of iron turning into gold through the treatment with specially prepared mercury. The comparison is argumentative and hence gives strength to the statement of the speaker.

In VIII/90 Nala begins to deliver to Damayantī the message of the gods who have requested her to act for their joy as the *Viśalyā* creeper, as they are swooning under the shafts of the brutal Cupid. The agony of the gods is due to their separation from Damayantī. It is she alone who can make them happy by accepting them. Hence she is compared with the *Viśalyā* creeper which can cure wounds whenever applied. The reference to the *Viśalyā* speaks of Śrīharṣa's knowledge of botany, but at the same time the comparison has been a very befitting one from the literary point of view.

XII/96 is a very beautiful example of metaphor drawn from the science of botany. Here the black sword of the king of Magadha, drawn from its sheath, is compared with a serpent coming out of its hole. It causes terror to the opponent kings in the battle-field. In order to protect themselves from this snake (in the form of his sword) they have to act as snake-charmers.

Roger Bacon, Geber, etc. Their pursuits, despite utter destruction of many invaluable lives, were the cause of many discoveries in the field of the science of chemistry.

They, therefore, put their fingers in their mouth as a mark of submission, and these fingers act as the medicinal creepers which a snake-charmer requires to subdue a snake. The reference to the science of botany is made when the finger is compared with the *Mahāsiddhausadhi* creeper that is useful in protecting a person from snake-bite and the comparison is an apt one

XVII/213 draws a simile from a person living in a hut made of straw and fearing a pigeon which possesses fire in its stomach—when it is said about Kali that in the same way he feared the *Ksatriya* king Nala who maintained the Vedic fire and was initiated in sacrificial rituals. The reference is to the high digestive capacity of a pigeon which possesses fire in its stomach and can, therefore, digest even pieces of stone. Such a pigeon, sitting on the roof of a house, is an evil omen and involves risk of fire¹. Though the simile is based on pun involved in a number of words (viz, *udbhūḍa-vīracitā-vāsaḥ*, *sāgneḥ*, *dvijāt* and *prāpa dīkṣitāt*), there is no touch of artificiality in it and the comparison is very appropriate. By comparing Nala with a pigeon which is able to digest even

1 Cf *agnih kapota-jatharam antah-praviṣṭo 'ta eva tad-bhakṣitā paṣana-kanikāpī jūyata ityātiḥyam| sāgneḥ angāra-bhakṣinah kapota-viśeṣo hyaṅgārān bhakṣayati| udbhūḍa tṛṇa-lāṣṭhadinā nirmuta-grhaḥ puruṣo 'gnyudgari-netrāt svopaveśana-mātreṇa grha-dahādyanīṣṭa-sūcakād grhopaḥ vilokitāt kapotat-ṛkāt pakṣinah sakāsād yathā bhayam prāpnoti tathā sā-vapī|*

pieces of stone, the poet perhaps suggests that Kali understood Nala to be competent enough to subdue his hostile power (viz., Kali).

XXII/99 speaks of the poet's knowledge of the art of navigation, while the metaphor he uses there makes the nocturnal description more picturesque. When the sun sinks low at the end of the day, the eyes of the people traverse expansive darkness by moonlight. This is tantamount to saying metaphorically that one crosses the perilous river with the help of a raft when there is a shipwreck.

These are some examples of the similes drawn from various *śāstras*. The text abounds in a good number of similar other examples. It is clear from the examples that not only had the poet a knowledge of the *śāstras* mentioned above, but so fully he had digested them that he could draw an idea from any one of them whenever necessary and could fit it well in the proper context. His poetic genius and scholarship have gone hand in hand, and it is a unique achievement on the part of the poet that the natural flow of poetry has not been hampered by the exhibition of scholarship. The epithet *Śāstra-kāvya*, as pointed out by Professor A. N. Jani,¹ is rightly applicable to the *Naiṣadhacarita*, and it is a great tribute to the poet in the sense that his *Śāstra* has not marred his *Kāvya*.

1. See his 'A Critical Study Of Śrīharṣa's *Naiṣadhīya-caritaṃ*,' Baroda, 1957 ; p. 267.

Ideas from social, economic and political fields

A man is a social being and a poet is no exception. He can hardly dissociate himself from the social environments of his time and is greatly influenced by them. Though the appeal of a poet's works is universal and is not for any particular sect or a particular age, it is the picture of the poet's own society that is generally revealed in his works. As regards our poet, almost a complete picture of the society of Śrīharṣa's time, along with the information of the economic and political conditions of that period, is obtained from the *Naisadhacarita*. Professor A. N. Jani has thoroughly noted them¹. So far as our subject-matter is concerned, it is interesting to note that a good number of similes have been drawn from social, economic and political fields.

The custom of *Satī dūha* (the burning of a devoted wife on the funeral pile of her husband) was in vogue in Śrīharṣa's time, and virtuous wives wilfully entered into the fire. It was also believed that such a devoted lady was able to bring about the resurrection of her expired husband by virtue of her merits. Śrīharṣa draws a simile from this custom and the aforesaid belief. The verse which gives a vivid description of the rising sun with its glow, runs as follows.—

*dihina prasamīd dīptir vāstam gate gata-vasare
prasamī samīdā praple pṛthivīn vāyūn rājirī*

1. See his 'A Critical Study Of Śrīharṣa's Naisadhacarita', Paroda, 1957, Chapters XV and XVI.

*adhara-bhuvanāt soddhṛtyaiṣā haṭhāt taraṇeḥ kṛtā
mara-pati-pura-prāptir dhatte satī-vrata-mūrtitām//*
(XIX/44)

"The devoted Light had entered the fire, when the Sun, her husband, went down, having reached the hour of decline of the bygone day. Now she appears as the image of the vow of a devoted woman ; for she hath brought about the ascent of the sun to heaven, forcibly raising him from the world below."¹ The sun sets in the evening, but its afterglow still remains in the sky for a short time and gradually fades away. The poet fancies the setting sun to be a dead man and its glow to be his devoted wife. The fading away of the glow has been fancied as the entrance of the devoted wife into the pyre of her husband. Next morning the sun is again seen in the eastern horizon rising from the lower region while its glow comes out a little earlier. This has been fancied as if the devoted wife, by virtue of her merits, is bringing about the resurrection of the dead husband whom she had followed. The poet thus finds human behaviour in Nature and the idea is highly poetic.

The society at that time, it appears, was very strict. Illegal latitude was not tolerated. Unchastity among women was a punishable offence. An unchaste woman was banished with her braid of hair cut off by a barber. The simile contained in the following verse, which describes the

1. Prof. Handiqui.

morning sunshine, has a reference to this practice :—

*dinam iva divākārtis tīkṣṇaiḥ kṣurairḥ savituh karais
 tumira-kavarī-lūnām kṛtvā niśām niradīdharatī
 sphurati paritah keśa-stomais tataḥ patayālubhīr
 dhruvam adhavalanī tat-tac-chāyac-chalād avanī-
 talam//*
 (XIX/55)

“The day, like a barber, banished the Night, lopping off her braid of darkness, with sharp razors, the rays of the sun. Verily the surface of the earth doth glisten black with masses of hair falling in consequence all around in the guise of diverse shadows.”¹ The comparison of the night with an unchaste woman is suggested here, whereas the day is expressly compared with a barber. The rays of the sun are compared with the sharp razors of the barber. Darkness is fancied to be the braid of hair of the night. Dispelling of darkness by the rays of the sun is fancied to be lopping off of the unchaste woman’s hair with the barber’s razors. Disappearance of the night is fancied as the banishment of the unchaste woman. The diverse shadows of trees and other objects which appear in the day-time have been fancied as the masses of hair falling all around. The vivid description of the verse has been made more picturesque by the simile drawn from the

picture of the banishment of a woman indulging in adultery.

Polygamy may be surmised from VIII/60 (*teṣāṃ idānīṃ kila kevalaṃ sā* etc.), but polyandry was an offence. The body of a woman indulging in polyandry was, it appears, cut off into pieces and given to birds for food—at least she was threatened with this severe punishment. In the following verse, dedicated by Nala to Paraśurāma, an Incarnation of Lord Viṣṇu, a simile has been drawn from the aforesaid practice :—

*pāṃśulā bahu-patir niyataṃ yā
vedhasāraci ruṣā nava-khaṇḍā/
tāṃ bhuvāṃ kṛtavato dvija-bhuktāṃ
yukta-kāritaratā tava jīyāt//*

(XXI/64)

“Glory to thy assiduity in doing what is right ! thou didst give the earth to the birds for food; the ever impure earth with many a husband. She had been cut into nine pieces by the Creator in his wrath.”¹ The earth with many kings ruling over its different parts is fancied as a licentious woman attached to many lovers.² The different spheres into which the earth is divided³ are fancied as

1. Prof. Handiqui.

2. The king is called ‘the husband of the earth’ (*bhū-pati*).

3. As the *Purāṇas* inform, the earth is divided into seven *dvīpas*. (Cf. *sapta-dvīpā’ yasumatī*.) Somewhere the number is mentioned as eighteen. One of them is *Jambū-dvīpa* which is again divided into nine lands of which one is *Bhārata* (India). It is probable that the word *bhū*, in the verse under discussion, stands for *Jambū-dvīpa* only and not

the different pieces into which the body of the licentious woman is cut off by the angry Creator. There is a pun on the word *dviya*. One meaning of the word is 'the Brahmin'. The reference is to the legend of Parasurama annihilating the *Ksatriyas* and giving the earth to the Brahmins as a gift (*dviya-bhuktā*). The other meaning of the word *dviya* is 'the bird,' and taking the word in this sense the poet fancies that the earth being a lewd woman, the different pieces into which her body had been cut off were given by Parasurāma to the birds for food (*dviya bhuktā*). Though the simile is allusive and to some extent ingenious, it has a literary appeal to a really appreciative mind, and we do not find anything artificial in it.

The society was perhaps a cosmopolitan one. Men of different characters were there. Cheats and thieves were also rampant. People, therefore, could not always rest assured about the safety of their property. So there were institutions of reliable persons most probably merchants, who used to act as deposit-keepers. They were known as *Niksepa-vaṇik*. The following verse draws a simile from the deposit keeper —

*kābhīr na tatrābhūnava smarajña-
viśvāsa nīksepa vaṇik kṛīṇ 'ham*

for the entire earth, and thus the division of *Jambu-dvīpa* into nine lands (*rava khandā*) is referred to here. Cf. *atha ca nava bhūmeh jambu-dvīpasya khandanī* | *bharata harivarṣa kimpuru śeṣaṣṭa bhadrasya ketumala ramyaka hiranmayottara kurusañjñani* (Candūpanḍita)

jihreti yan naiva kuto 'pi tiryak
kaścit tiraścās trapate na tena||
 (III/43)

Speaking of the ladies of the harem of Nala the swan gives utterance to these words, "Who among them does not entrust me with the new mandate of Cupid as one does a merchant with one's deposit (*nikṣepa*)? As a bird is not put to shame before any one, nobody feels diffident before a bird." The ladies of the harem of Nala confide their love-messages to the swan (which acts as their messenger in the love-affairs); its comparison with the *Nikṣepa-vaṇik* has, therefore, been very appropriate.¹

*Mādhukarī*² or collecting alms by begging from door to door by mendicants was probably a common practice of that period. The following verse, uttered by Nala while describing the prettiness of the different limbs of Damayantī's body, draws a simile from *Mādhukarī* :—

tuṣāra-niḥśeṣitam abja-sargaṁ
vidhātu-kāmasya punar vidhātu||

1. For a similar idea of safe-keeping, see *N.C.*, VII/55 (*divā-rajanyo ravi-soma-bhiteḥ* etc.) which bears resemblance to *Kumārasambhava*, I/43 (*candraṁ gatā padma-guṇān na bhūikte* etc.).

2. *Mādhukarī*—(1) 'Collecting alms by begging from door to door, as a bee collects honey by moving from flower to flower.' (2) 'Alms obtained from five different places.' (Prof. V. S. Apte's *Skt.—Eng. Dictionary*).

*pañcasv-ihāsyāṅghrī-kareṣv-abhikhyā-
bhiksūdhunū mādhuakarī sadṛksā//*

(VII/103)

“The Creator’s begging of the beauty of these five limbs of hers—the face, the feet and the hands, being desirous of creating again the lotus-beds destroyed by frost, is now like the begging of those mendicants who restrict themselves to five households for their daily alms”.¹ As a mendicant obtains alms from five different places, similarly the Creator is begging beauty from the five different limbs of Damayantī’s body in order to re-create the destroyed lotus-beds. The simile is simple, but it has a deeper suggestion. It is suggested that the beauty of Damayantī’s face, feet and hands excelled that of the lotus-beds, otherwise there is no justification of the Creator begging beauty from the limbs of Damayantī in order to re-create the lotus-beds. To create something one naturally takes elements from a superior object. Not only so, it further hints at the everlasting excellence of Damayantī who remains a grand store-house of beauty when even the Creator’s repository is exhausted. It has to be remembered that a mendicant, unlike an ordinary beggar, would not approach a low man for alms but only the house-

1. Prof Handiqui. He accepts here the second one of the two meanings of the word *mādhuakarī* suggested by Prof Apte. This is quite logical, because in that case the word *pañcasu* occurring in the text goes well both with the *Upamāna* and with the *Upameya*.

holders who are supposed to have a high status in the society. The comparison of the Creator begging the beauty of Damayanti's limbs to a begging mendicant is, therefore, very appropriate and significant in so far as the other excellences of Damayanti, viz., her sanctity, dignity etc. are also beautifully suggested thereby.

Hunting was in vogue at that time. While describing the morning sky in Canto XIX the poet draws a simile from falconry¹ in the following verse :—

*nabhasi mahasām dhvānta-dhvāṅkṣa-pramā-
paṇa-patrinām
iha viharanīḥ śyainampātān raver avadhā-
rayan/
śaśa-viśasana-trāsād āśām agūc caramām śaśi
tad-adhigamanāt tārā-pārāvatair udaḍīyata||
(XIX/12)*

“Concluding from the hoverings in yonder sky of those hawks, the rays of the sun, killing the crows of darkness, that the sun is going ahunting; the moon betook himself to the west for fear of his hare being killed; while those pigeons, the stars, flew away on receiving the news.”² The moon and the stars do not shine in the day-time, and the poet

1. If the word *patrin* occurring in the verse means ‘a falcon’, then the picture is one of falconry; but if the word be taken in the sense of ‘an arrow’, then the verse refers to hunting (in general) with arrows. The word *śyainampātā* means either ‘hawking’ or ‘hunting’.

2. Prof. Handiqui.

gives here rather a humorous interpretation¹ of this natural phenomenon. The sun is described as a falconer and the solar rays as his falcons killing crows (in the form of darkness) in the sky. Falcons kill hares also and hence they are known as *Śasāda* or hare eaters'. The moon has a hare (in the form of its stain) on its lap for which it (the moon) is known as *Śasānka*. It is fancied that the moon, when it understands that the sun is going a hunting, flies away to the west, i.e., in the opposite direction, lest the falcons of the sun kill the hare lying on its lap. The nocturnal stars are described as pigeons. When they come to know that the sun-hunter is chasing the crows and the moon has fled out of fear, they also fly away apprehending an imminent danger. The simple meaning is that when the sun rises in the east and dispels darkness, the moon sets in the west and the stars fade away. But the picture is presented with such a poetic fancy that the reader cannot but pause to relish.

The society was prosperous and civilised. The people paid much value to arts and crafts. The poem gives ample evidence of this culture. Large edifices with spherical vaults of gold on the top were built in the city. While describing the uncommon beauty of Damayanti, the kings assembled in her bridal chamber (*Śayamvara*) describe her two breasts as the spherical vaults on the top of the two palaces built by her youth for Kama and Rati,

1 For more examples of humour, see under *Humorous ideas*.

the god and goddess of love, who were dwelling in her heart. The verse runs thus :—

*vyadhatta saudhe rati-kāmayos tad-
bhaktam vayo 'syā hr̥di vāsa-bhājoh!
tad-agra-jāgrat-pr̥thu-śātakumbha-
kumbhau na sambhāvayati stanau kah||*
(X/122)

“Two palaces did the age that is devoted to Cupid and Rati build for them, residing in her heart. Who does not guess her breasts to be two rounded cupolas of gold flashing at their top ?”¹ Youth is the proper age for the advent of Cupid, and the verse is a metaphorical description of the youthfulness of Damayantī. Youth is described as a devotee of Cupid and Rati, and out of its devotion it has built two palaces for them in the heart of Damayantī. But as the palaces are inside her heart, they are not visible from outside. The only visible portions thereof are the two cupolas which are the breasts of Damayantī. The idea is that, Damayantī is a youthful girl and as such her breasts are fully developed. At the same time it is suggested that her heart is full of passionate love. It gives a vivid picture of a marriageable girl and, therefore, justifies the self-choosing ceremony (*Svayamivara*) arranged for her. In other words, the description is very appropriate to the context.

1. Prof. Handiqui.

Horticulture was known at that time. Trees were bred with much care with the provision of water-basins and pouring of water. This is clear from the metaphorical description of the following verse where the gods are presented as the garden of *Kalpa* (All-giving) trees :—

*pradakṣiṇa-prākramaṇālavāla-
vilepa-dhūpācaraṇāmbu-sekaiḥ/
iṣṭaṇ ca mṛṣṭaṇ ca phalaṇ suvānā
devā hi kalpa-druma-kānanān naḥ!/
(XIV/2)*

“The gods are a grove of all-giving *Kalpa* trees to us, bearing choice sweet fruits as a result of the provision of water-basins, namely, the ceremonial circumambulations to the right ; and pourings of water, to wit, the offering of unguents and incense.”¹ As trees bear fruits when bred with the provision of water-basins and pouring of water, so do the gods when they are propitiated by ceremonial circumambulation to the right (*pradakṣiṇa-prākramaṇa*) and offering of unguents and incense (*vilepa-dhūpācaraṇa*). In order to suggest that the gods give their devotees whatever is desired by them, they are compared with the *Kalpa-druma*

1. Prof. Handiqui.

Some commentators take *vilepa-dhūpācaraṇā (varaṇā)-mbu-seka* as a subordinate *Dvandva* compound of *vilepa-dhūpācaraṇa (varaṇa)* and *ambu-seka*. Accordingly, they find here a reference to the provision of incense and unguents for destroying the worms which damage trees and plants.

For the idea of the provision of water-basins, see also *N.C.*, II/105 (*kareṇa mīnaṇi nija-ketanān dadhad drumālavālāmbu-niveśa-śaikayā*).

or 'Wish-yielding trees'¹ and not with ordinary trees. As the *Kalpa-druma* is supposed to grant all desires, the comparison is very appropriate.

The people used to take various kinds of food. There is a vivid picture of sumptuous feast in Canto XVI. Various other scattered references to different sorts of edibles and drinks are also found, and a few very homely similes have been drawn from them. One of the edible items was *Apūpa* or *Pūpa* (cake) which was also offered to the gods by the devotees. This has been used in a simile in VII/61 (*viyoga-vāṣpāñcita-netra-padma-etc.*). Here Brahmā has been said to have created the ears of Damayantī as two ceremonial cakes to be offered to Cupid and Rati with the usual water and flowers, in the form of her tears and eyes, accompanying the offering. It signifies the passion-exciting beauty of Damayantī's pair of ears. Professor Handiqui rightly comments : "Here the gift is made by the Creator to Cupid to serve as one more weapon in his armoury."² Rice-cake (*Parpaṭa*) prepared with sesame (*tila*) was another eatable item and this was also used in a religious offering. This has served a simile in XXII/149 (*upanātam uḍu-puṣpa-jātam āste etc.*) where Nala asks Damayantī to worship Cupid

1. For the idea of the 'Wish-yielding tree', see *N.C.*, I/15 (*ayariḥ daridro bhaviteti vaidhasīm etc.*); IX/74 (*divo dhavas tvāri yadi kalpa-sākhinam etc.*).

2. 'Naiṣadhacarita Of Śrīharṣa,' Second Edition, Poona, 1956 ; p. 97, footnote.

by offering the moon taking it as a rice-cake stuffed with sesame, while the stars will be the usual flowers of offering. The idea lying behind the expression is that the moon is one of the *Uddīpana vibhāvas* or passion-exciting objects helping the development of erotic sentiment (*Śrngāra rasa*) out of *Rati* or love. As Cupid is the presiding deity of love, the moon has been metaphorically described as an offering to him, and its comparison with a rice cake stuffed with sesame is appropriate owing to the distinct similarity of the two¹. Drinking was a luxury in feast. In XXII/146 (*sapīteh samprīter ajanī* etc.) the moon has been described as a jar of sun stone (*dinamāni māni grāva mānikah*) used on a festive occasion of the stars when, it may be fancied, the stars assemble round the jar and place on it a bowl of sapphire, namely, its stain, to draw (wine² in the form of its) nectar. By depicting the moon as a jar of drink the poet suggests its intoxicating nature (for which it is supposed to be an *Uddīpana vibhava* in the development of *Śrngāra*).

A number of beliefs and superstitions of the people of the contemporary period have been mentioned or hinted at in the poem. A few similes also have been drawn from them. Some of them may be

1 The full moon with its stain appears as a round rice-cake stuffed with sesame

2 The idea of wine is suggested by the words *sapīteh* (for festive drinking) and *casaka* (a wine glass). A drinking bout or *madhu goṣṭhi* is actually mentioned in XX/80 (*tīvāryajah kṛḍayan mdhye madhu goṣṭhi ruseksitah*).

exemplified here. The sight of a water-jar (*udakumbha*) at the time of one's departure was believed to be a good presage. In XIX/25 (*raha sahacarīm etāṁ rājan* etc.) the rising sun has been likened to a golden water-jar which beauty (*Śrī*), before going from the *Kumuda* (white water-lily) to the *Nalina* (lotus flower), desires to see. There is a poetic convention that in the morning the water-lilies close up their petals and the lotus flowers open.¹ The poet fancies that beauty passes from the water-lily to the lotus, while the rising sun acts as the auspicious pitcher (*Maṅgala-kumbha*) at the time of its departure. The word *maṅgala-kumbha* actually occurs in XV/74 (*ajānatī kāpi vilōkanotsukā* etc.) where such an auspicious pitcher has been superimposed on the breast of a woman of the city, the covering cloth of which was half blown away by air, as she was very much eager to have a look at Nala who was going for his marriage ceremony. The superimposition is based simply on the similarity of the two objects in shape. Some other objects like mirrors, honey, flowers (specially lotus), sprouts, etc. were also considered to be auspicious. In XV/76 (*lasan-nakhādarśa-mukhambuja-smita*-etc.) it has been metaphorically described that the women of the city, assembled to have a look at Nala while he was going for marriage, served auspicious presages for the king, as they

1. Cf. *ahnyambhojanī niśāyāṁ vilasati kumudam*
(*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VII/19).

had mirrors in the form of their flashing nails, lotuses in the form of their faces, flowers in the form of their smiles, honey in the guise of their voice and sprouts in the appearance of their hands. The metaphors are significant too. The comparison of the nails of the ladies with mirrors suggests their natural lustre ;¹ that of the faces with lotuses suggests their beauty ; that of their smiles with flowers suggests their deliciousness ; that of their voice with honey suggests its sweetness ; and that of their hands with sprouts or young leaves (*pallava*) suggests their tenderness.

These are some of the many popular beliefs of that period which have served our poet with simple and homely similes.

As regards the general economic condition of that period, we do not, however, get any details except what may be surmised from the gorgeous descriptions of streets, palaces, etc. *Varāṭa* (also known as *Kaparda*) or *cowrie* was the means of currency. Men used to purchase gold by *cowries* after testing it in a touchstone. In a graphic description of the evening twilight in the last canto the poet draws a simile from this practice :—

astūcale 'smin nikaṣopalābhe

. sandhyā-kaṣollekha-parīkṣito yaḥ

vikriya taṁ heli-hiraṇya-piṇḍaṁ

tārā-varāṭān iyaṁ ādita dyauḥ

(XXII/13)

1. Cf. *nakṣa-kṛāṇa*—a very favourite expression of Bhaṭṭa.

"Selling that lump of gold, the sun, that was tested on the touchstonelike Mount of Sunset, the evening glow being the trail left by the abrasion, the sky hath taken in return cowries, the stars!"¹ The sky has been depicted as a person selling a lump of gold, the sun (to the other hemisphere). The sun setting in the west appears as a lump of gold. The Western Mountain (*Astācala*) has been likened to a touchstone to test the purity of the gold, the sun. The evening glow has been likened to a mark of friction left by abrasion of the lump of gold on the touchstone. The stars have been described as the *cowries* received by the sky for selling the lump of gold. The idea is this, the sun has set, the stars have appeared in the sky, but the scarlet line of the evening has not yet faded away. But the simile used by the poet has given the description a highly graphic touch.

Gold coin was also current and this was sometimes forged by imposters to cheat others. This practice has been referred to in a simile in connection with a nocturnal picture in the last canto :—

ādatta dīpraṁ maṇim ambarasya

datvā yad asmai khalu sāya-dhūrtaḥ/

rajyat-tuṣāra-dyuti-kūṭa-hema

tat pāṇḍu jātaṁ rajataṁ kṣaṇena//

(XXII/52)

"Dusk the Imposter gave a counterfeit gold coin, the reddening moon, to the sky ; and took posses-

sion of the sun, heaven's radiant gem. Forthwith the coin turned out to be a pale piece of silver."¹ The moon, when rises in the east, appears red. But within a short time its redness fades away and it appears white. The poet fancies the rising moon as a gold coin and the white moon as a silver one. He depicts the dusk as an imposter (*sāya-dhūrtali*) and the setting sun as a radiant gem which the sky possesses (*ambarasya dīpraṁ maṇim*). It is poetically fancied that the dusk purchases the radiant gem of the sky by a counterfeit gold coin made by gilding a silver one. But its artificial golden hue does not last long and fades away very soon. The sky is thus deceived by the dusk. The natural phenomenon, which is so metaphorically and graphically depicted is this: The lustrous sun, which was shining a little before, has set. The moon has risen. It was red a few moments back, but now its red hue has disappeared and it appears as white as silver.

So far as the political condition of the period is concerned, some glimpses are available from the poem, but no details. Similes from the political field are also not wanting. The emperor used to receive tributes from the vanquished kings and the poet has skilfully utilised this idea in a simile while describing the beauty of Damayanti's arms. The verse runs thus:—

*asyā bhujābhyām vijitād viśāt kinī
prthak karo 'grhyata tat-prasūnam!*

*ihekṣyate tan na grhāḥ śriyaḥ kair
na gīyate vā kara eva lokaiḥ||*

(X/123)

Have her arms severally taken from the defeated lotus-stalk its flower as a tribute? Who is there that does not find here (i.e., in these arms) this flower, which is beauty's abode, and does not praise it (i.e., this flower in the form of her hand) as her hand?¹ The poet wants to say that Damayantī's arms are more beautiful than the lotus-stalk, and fancies that in a contest of beauty her arms have defeated the lotus-stalk and as a tribute (*kara*) they have taken the flower from the stalk which now shines as her hand (*kara*). In other words, Damayantī's hands are as beautiful as the lotus, the abode of beauty or goddess *Lakṣmī*. In the last foot the poet simply justifies the simile by skilful use of the equivocal term *kara*. The import is this: As people really appreciate the pair of Damayantī's *karas* (hands) which are as beautiful as the lotus, it is quite probable that she has received them from the defeated lotus-stalk as a *kara* (tribute).

Employment of spies, including female ones, it seems, was adopted as a means in the machi-

1. Professor Handiqui takes the word *iha* occurring in the verse to mean 'on the earth' and translates the second half in a different way. There is a pun on the word *kara* which means (1) 'tribute' and (2) 'hand.' 'Tribute' is superimposed on the 'hand' owing to the sameness of the word expressing them.

nery of administration. The following verse comprises a simile drawn from espionage :—

*dine mama dveṣiṇi kīḍṛg eṣāṁ
 pracāra ityākalanāya cūrīḥ/
 chāyā vidhāya prativastu-lagnāḥ
 prāveśayat praṣṭum ivāndhakārah//*
 (XXII/39)

“The darkness had employed shadows, attached to diverse objects, as its spies, in order to find out the movements of things during the day, its enemy. [Lit., How do these fare during the day, my enemy?] It hath now recalled them [lit., caused them to enter (the house)] as if to question them (on the work they have done).¹ The verse is uttered by Nala in connection with the description of nocturnal darkness. In the day-time darkness disappears owing to its everlasting enmity with the former.² As a king, though he himself keeps away from his opponent, sends spies to his state in order to keep an eye upon him and his subjects, so also the darkness, the poet fancies, sends spies in the day-time, and it is the shadows, attached to diverse objects, which are fancied

1. Prof. Handiqui. “The evening shadows”, mentioned by him in the footnote, does not give a satisfactory meaning.

2 Cf *divākarād rakṣati yo guhāsu līnaṁ divā-bhītaṁ vāndhakāraṁ* [Kumārasambhava, I/12/A-B.]

to be the spies.¹ But where do they go at night? The poet further fancies that at night they are recalled by darkness in its residence to question on how far they have discharged their duties of espionage during the day-time. In the machinery of administration also the same thing happens. The spies employed by a king or ruler to collect secret information from his opponent's state meet the king or ruler at a certain time to communicate to him what they have been able to know.² The idea, therefore, though a pure poetic fancy, is very appropriate.

We have had thus a glimpse of the social, economic and political conditions of Śrīharṣa's time through a brief study of the similes drawn from the respective fields.³ The relevant verses quoted or referred to above are of much value both from the historical and from the literary point of view. This may be discussed at length as an independent subject of study which will be very interesting for a student of Indian history. But let us leave the discussion at this stage and pass on to other features of Śrīharṣa's similes.

1. As the word *chāyā*, meaning 'a shadow', is feminine, the shadows are described here as female spies (*cārī*).

2. See Viśākhadatta's *Mudrārākṣasa*, Acts I and II; Bhāravi's *Kirātārjunīya*, Canto I.

3. A fuller list is available in Professor Jani's thesis.

Erotic ideas

Śṛṅgāra or erotic sentiment is the principal *Rasa* (*Āṅgī-rasa*) in this poem, and in its delineation Śrīharṣa has proved his master hand. The poet himself has described his work as "charming with the delineation of erotic sentiment"¹ (in the colophon of the first canto) and as "the moon of the nectar of erotic sentiment"² (in the colophon of the eleventh canto). It is noteworthy that apart from the general delineation of erotic sentiment, the poet has drawn a number of similes from erotic ideas. Thus, while requesting Nala to act as their messenger to Damayanti, Varuṇa describes *Kīrti* or Fame as his (Nala's) beloved wife and the stream of water, which Nala pours on his supplicants' hands at the time of presenting gifts to them,³ as her pearlstring. The verse runs thus :—

ūcivān ucitam akṣaram etaṁ
pūṣa-pūṣir api pūṣim udasya/
kīrtir eva bhavatūṁ priya-dārā
dāna-nīra-jhara-mauktika-hūrā//

(V/128)

1. *śṛṅgāra-bhaṅgā mahā-kāvyē cāruṇi naiṣadhīyacarite*

2. *śṛṅgārāmṛta-śītagau..... mahā-kāvyē cāruṇi naiṣadhīyacarite*

3. Before presenting a gift it was customary to pour water on the supplicant's hand which signified the bestower's resolve to give. Cf. Gautama's *Dharmasūtras* : *svasti-vidya kīlāśa-dānam ap-pūram* (I/5/16) and *dadātiṣu calaṁ dhar-myeṣu* (I/5/17).

"Varuṇa, too, raising his hand, spoke some appropriate words to him, 'Fame alone, whose pearl-string is the stream of water offered in connection with gifts, is thy beloved wife'."¹ Thus depicting Fame as the wife of Nala, Varuṇa dissuades him from cherishing the desire of getting Damayantī as his wife and persuades him to plead for the gods to Damayantī. Varuṇa further clarifies his utterance :—

*preyasī jita-sudhāmśu-mukha-śrīr
yā na muñcati diganta-gatāpi/
bhaṅgi-saṅgama-kuraṅga-dṛg-arthe
kaḥ kadarthayati tām api kīrtim//*
(V/131)

"Fame, that dear one, the beauty of whose visage surpasses the moon, and who does not forsake her lover, even when she goes to the farthest ends of the directions,—who will maltreat even Fame for the sake of a gazelle-eyed damsel, union with whom is of transient duration?"² The description of *Kīrti* as one's devoted wife is very striking. She is said to have surpassed even the moon in white complexion.³ Unlike a low woman she never forsakes her husband, that is to say, fame attaches to one's name wherever one goes. (Nay, she does

1. Prof. Handiqui.

2. Prof. Handiqui.

3. *Kīrti* is poetically supposed to be white. Cf. *dhavalatā varṇyate hāsa-kīrtyoḥ* (*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VII/19).

so even after the person, her husband, is dead ¹) Thus describing Kīrti as a beautiful as well as chaste woman Varuna tries to make Nala attach to her and asks him not to forsake her for the sake of a worldly damsel who, though beautiful, cannot assure one of a lifelong union. What Varuna wants to say is this, if Nala spares Damayanti for the sake of the gods, he will attain immortal fame which is far more covetable than a mortal spouse ² The poet has painted a graphic picture to express this simple idea.

Again, in the assembly of the self choosing ceremony (Śayamvara) of Damayanti, when Sarasvatī had tried to take her from the middle of the way to the gods, she turned her face away, and the poet describes this in the following verse by drawing a simile from a new married bride —

*mukhabjam āvartana lola nālam
krtvāli hum hum rava lakṣya-lakṣyam/
bhīmodbhavā tām munude 'nka pāṇin
devya navodheva drdhām vrodhuh//*
(XIV/36)

"But Damayanti repressed the close embrace of the goddess, even as a newly married bride does

1 Cf *kīrti śeṣa* (surviving or remaining only in fame)—a very common expression in Sanskrit literature

2 Cf *api śva dehat kumutendriyarthad yaso-dhananam hi yaso garīṣaḥ* (Raghuvamśa, XIV/35[C-D])

that of her spouse, briskly moving her lotus-stalk neck as she turned her lotus face away (lit., making her lotus face such that its stalk grew agile in turning aside), (a face) distinguished by the humming noise (lit., marked by a symbol, the humming noise) of those bees who were her maiden friends."¹ The comparison with a newly married wife repressing the embrace of her spouse hints at Damayanti's graceful amorous gestures by which she must have attracted the assembly. Further, a newly married wife represses her husband's embrace not out of aversion to him, but out of her natural bashfulness.² The simile, therefore, suggests Damayanti's bashfulness also which is considered to be an excellence of a girl.

While describing vividly the dark night in the last canto, Nala draws an apt simile from *Abhisārikās*³ going to meet their lover in secret :—

1. Prof. Handiqui.

The noise (*hurū-hurū-rava*) made by Damayanti's friends indicated their disapproval of her dislike for the gods.

2. Cf. '*talpa-gatāpi ca sutaṇuḥ śvāsāsaṅgaṃ na yā sehe/ samprati sā hṛdaya-gataṃ priya-pāṇinī mandam ākṣipati/*' ...*yā nava-vadhūḥ palyaṇika-śayitā śvāsasyāsaṅga-mātreṇāpi saṅku-cad-aṅga-latikābhūt, sā, samprati prasthāna-pūrva-rajanyāṃ pravaṭsyat-patikā priyeṇa saśaṅkena samarpitam hṛdi pāṇim nava-vadhū-jāti-svābhāvyaād ākṣipati, paran tu mandam/* (Jagadnātha, *Rasagaṅgādhara*, I; Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1955; pp. 41-42.)

3. *Abhisārikā* = 'A woman who either goes to meet her lover or keeps an appointment made by him.' (Prof. V. S. Apte's Skt.—Eng. Dictionary.) See *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III/89-93 (*abhisārayate kāntam.....kvacid āśrayati/*)

dhvāntaīnanābhyā śitinūmbarena
dīśaḥ śaraiḥ sūna-śarasya tāraiḥ|
mandāksa lakṣyā nīsi mām anindau
sersyā bhavāyāntyabhisārīkābhāh||
 (XXII/33)

"Damayantī, thou mightest be jealous At this moonless hour of the night the bashful regions of the sky, looking like maidēns setting out to meet their lovers, are coming towards me The darkness is their musk paint, the blue sky their apparel, and the stars the flowery arrows of Cupid hovering above them"¹ The quarters or the regions of the sky (*dīśaḥ*) are described as *Abhisārīkas* and Nala as their lover to whom they are coming to meet It is traditionally supposed and described in Sanskrit literature that in the moonless hour of night the *Abhisārīkūs* go to meet their lovers veiling themselves in blue garments and in the moonlit night they use white garments for the same purpose They go to meet their lovers being nicely dressed In the present context darkness is fancied to be the musk-paint of the quarters, the *Abhisārīkūs*, and the blue sky as their blue apparel² As the *Abhisārīkūs* are naturally affected by passion, the

1 Prof Handiqui

2 Both the meanings, viz., 'blue sky' and 'blue apparel' are presented by means of pun on the word *ambarena*, *śitina* being an adjective to it

flowery arrows of Cupid are allegorically said to hover above them, and in the present context the stars are fancied to be those flowery arrows. The verse thus gives a clear picture of *Abhisāra*. In the last foot of the verse the speaker cuts a joke. If the *Abhisārikās* approach a married man, his wife can by no means tolerate it. Nala wilfully depicts the quarters as *Abhisārikās* coming to him when his wife Damayantī is present there. Hence he says in joke : *serṣyā bhava*—O Damayantī, you get jealous, as the *Abhisārikās* are coming to your husband.¹

These are some of the erotic ideas used by Śrīharṣa. Not that these ideas are absolutely novel, but the manner in which the poet presents them or uses them in the form of similes makes the verses so appealing.

Humorous ideas

Special attention should be paid to the similes having a touch of humour in them which we miss elsewhere. Śrīharṣa was well skilled in creating humour and in this respect no other poet in Sanskrit literature than Śūdraka deserves comparison with him. The *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Śūdraka, which is a drama of erotic sentiment, is a wonderful specimen of *Hāsyā-rasa* or the sentiment of humour as well. The humour created

1. For another simile drawn from *Abhisārikās* using blue apparel in darkness and white silk cloth in moonlight, see. N.C., XXII/42 (*dhvānte drumāntūn abhisārikās tvam* etc.)

by Śūdraka is mainly of two types : (1) humour out of comic situation¹ and (2) humour out of nonsensical utterances² To the second category belong a good number of similes used by Śakāra where the *Upamāna* is utterly baseless Thus, describing Vasantasenā coming under his control, he draws a simile from Kuntī subdued by Rāvana—an idea formed of the foolish amalgamation of the episodes of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*³ Equally humorous is the simile when he compares the murder of Vasantasenā by himself with that of Sītā by Cānākya or of Draupadī by Jaṭāyus⁴ But the humour created by our poet is not of this sort He does not create humour out of comic situations or nonsensical utterances, but

1 Vide the gambling scene in Act II; the conversation between *Vidūṣaka* (Maitreya) and *Ceṭa* (Kumbhila) in Act V

2 Contained mainly in the utterances of Śakāra (*Sams-thānaka*) Also cf *āh dāsīe dhīe kim bhaṇāsi coraṁ kappiā sandhī nikkantaḥ* (*Vidūṣaka* in Act III; Prof V. G Paranjpe's edition, Poona, 1937; p 63)

3. *cīṭṭha vasantaśenīe cīṭṭhaḥ*
mama maanam anangam bammaham vaddhaanti
nisi a saanake me niddaam pakkhuantiḥ
paśalaśi bhāa-bhīdā pakkhalanti khalanti
mama vasam anujadā lāvanasśeva kuntīḥ
 (I/21)

4 *cānakkena jadha śudā mālīdā bhālāde jugeḥ*
evam de moḍaśśam jadāū via dovadimḥ
 (VIII/35)

Bhārata-yuga ('*bhālāde juge*') mentioned in the verse is also nonsensical. There was no such age

his very poetical fancies are humorous. Perhaps the means adopted by Śūdraka in his drama would not have been fitting in the poem of Śrīharṣa. So in Śrīharṣa's poem we should not expect the dramatic humour of Śūdraka. In Canto VI where invisible Nala meets the damsels in the inner apartment of the royal palace of Kuṇḍina one finds slight touches of humour in the situations described by the poet; but the situations there, it must be admitted, are not so humorous or comic as those in the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. Śrīharṣa creates humour mainly by skilful word-plays¹ and offering preternatural interpretations to facts and accepted truths or traditional beliefs.² The so called humorous similes,

1. e.g., IX/23 (*jalādhipas tvām adīśan mayi dhruvam* etc), V/61—64 (*īkṣya tasya varuṇas taruṇatvam.....manyate sma khalu kauśikam eva*), and so on, where the humour is based on pun on the words *jalādhipa*, *pareta-rāja*, *marutrat*, *ūrdhva-mukha*, *jaḍa*, *kāla*, *anala*, *kauśika*, etc. The pun on the words *śrī* and *pada* in VII/100 (*ruṣārūṇā sarva-guṇair jayanti* etc.) makes its idea very humorous by way of describing the beauty of Damayanti's feet. The pun on the word *śulūka* in XXII/36 (*dhvāntasya vāmorū vicāraṇāyām* etc.) speaks very humorously of the soundness of the *Vaiśeṣika* doctrine of darkness. In the last canto of the poem we get a good number of humorous ideas including humorous similes.

2. As for example, the interpretation of an aphorism of Pāṇini, viz., *apavarge tṛtīyā (Aṣṭādhyāyī, II/3/6)* offered by the spokesman of heretics in XVII/68 (*ubhayaī prakṛtiḥ kāmē* etc.) is extremely humorous. In XXII/57 (*vidhis tuṣārartu-dāntī karṣam* etc.) the poet gives a highly humorous

most of which have taken the form of *Utpreksā*, are most striking among them Professor A N Jani has rightly remarked about the use of *Utpreksā* in the *Naisadhacarita* "In fact, this figure preponderates in the poem. Most of his *Utpreksas* are original. He derides the normal *upamānas* and introduces new and naive ideas. The title 'Utpreksakavi' can be conferred upon Śrīharsa without any hesitation"¹ We are, however, concerned only with those *Utpreksās* which are clearly based on comparison and, therefore, according to our terminology, come under the category of simile²

explanation as to why the days in the winter season are short and the moonlit nights are cold. The interpretation offered in IX/157 (*śvas tasyah priyam aptum uddhura dhiyah* etc) as to why night is called *Triyama* is also very humorous. There are many such examples which give evidence of Śrīharṣa's sense of humour.

1 'A Critical Study Of Śrīharsa's *Naisadhiyacaritam*' Baroda 1957, pp 244-245. The term *utprekṣa kavi* is mentioned by the poet himself in XXII/146 (*sapiteh sam-priṭer aṇaṇi* etc).

Cf 'The *Atīśayokti* in the *Nai C* has its ally *Utpreksa* which often appears as implied (*gamyā*), and Śrīharsa being a pastmaster in extravagance of fancy utilises them in a manner and in proportions hardly attempted by any other great writer" (Prof Sivaprasada Bhattacharya in his *The Naisadhacarita In Its Bearing On The Alankara code* Prof P K Gode Commemoration Volume Poona 1960, Part III, p 25).

2 Daṇḍin defines *Utpreksa* as a figure where the natural attribute of an animate or inanimate object is fancied otherwise —

Even an ordinary idea, which is very common in classical literature, is expressed by our poet in such a way with a touch of humour that it becomes quite novel. Thus, when the poet wants to compare the face of Damayantī with the moon—an idea so common in classical Sanskrit literature—he does it in his own characteristic mode of expression, and the reader can hardly miss the humour. The poet gives a humorous explanation of the stain of the moon by saying that a vital portion of the moon has been taken away by the Creator to make the face of Damayantī; consequently a cavity is created there through which the blue sky is seen; from the distant earth it appears to be the stain of the moon. He says :—

*anyathaiva sthitā vṛttiś cetanasyetarasya vā/
anyathotprekṣyate yatra tām utprekṣāṁ vidur budhāḥ//*
(Kāvya-darśa, II/221.)

It is not necessarily based on comparison. Cf. *upamāye upamāna-sambhāvanam evotprekṣeti navyair uktam, tat prācīnānām anabhimatam ityagre sphuṣṭibhaviṣyati/* (Commentary of Premacandra Tarkavāgiśa on the above verse.) The following examples offered by Daṇḍin are not based on comparison :—

*madhyandīnārka-santaptah sarasīm gāhate gajah/
manye mārtaṇḍa-grhyāṇi padmānyuddhartum udyataḥ//
snātum pātum viśānyattum kariṇo jala-gāhanam/
tad vaira-niṣkrayāyeti kavīnotprekṣya varṇyate//
karṇasya bhūṣaṇam idaṁ mamāyati-virodhinaḥ/
iti karṇotpalam prāyas tava drṣṭyā vilanḥhyate//
apāṅga-bhāga-pātinyā drṣṭer aṁśubhir utpalam/
sprṣyate vā navetyevam kavīnotprekṣya varṇyate//*
(Kāvya-darśa, II/222-225.)

hr̥ta-sūram ivendu-maṇḍalaṁ
damayantī-vadanāya vedhasū/
'kr̥ta-madhya-vilaṁ vilokyate
dhr̥ta-gambhīra-khanī-kha-nīlima//
 (II/25)

"The disc of the moon, the essence of which seems to have been taken away by the Creator for making Damayanti's face, is (for that reason) seen to have a hollow made in the middle, and hold the blue of the sky in the deep cavity."¹

More humorous is the expression when the poet compares the mass of hair of Nala with that of the *Camarī* deer and asserts that the former excels the latter in beauty. It is the nature of a *Camarī* to wag her tail, but the poet fancies that the wagging of her tail is meant for saying again and again to Nala that the desire of her mass of hair to be similar to his hair is a childish prank which should not be taken as an offence,—as does a mother when her child² wants to challenge a superior person. Thus runs the verse :—

sva-bāla-bhārasya tad-uttamāṅgajaiḥ
samaṁ camaryeva tulābhilāṣiṇaḥ/
anūgase saṁsati bāla-cāpalaṁ
punaḥ punaḥ puccha-vilolanac-chalāt//
 (I/25)

1. Prof. Handiqui.

2. The word *bāla* (hair) occurring in the first foot of the verse punningly means 'a child' also.

"The Camarī deer, under the pretext of wagging her tail, seems to say again and again that the desire of her mass of hair to be similar to his hair is a childish prank which does not constitute an offence."¹

In a similar context Kālidāsa, while pointing out the excellence of Pārvatī's hair in comparison with that of the Camarī, says that if animals had a sense of shame the Camarīs would have shaken off their fondness for hair whose excellence is superseded by that of Pārvatī's mass of hair. The verse is as follows :—

*lajjā tirścān yadī cetasi syād
asaṁśayaṁ parvata-rāja-putryāḥ |
taṁ keśa-pāśaṁ prasamīkṣya kuryur
bāla-priyatvaṁ śīthilāṁ camaryāḥ ||*²

But so far as the humour is concerned, the verse of Śrīharṣa is certainly an improvement upon the verse of Kālidāsa, inasmuch as in Kālidāsa we miss the humour.

As the verse speaks of the beauty of Nala's hair, the Upameya, as superseding that of the Camarī, the Upamāna, it is an example of the figure known

1. Prof. Handique.

2. Kumārasambhava, I/48.

as *Vyatiṛeka*,¹ which is here suggested and not expressed, that is to say, it is a case of *Vyatiṛeka-dhvanī*. Śrīharṣa, it is curious to note, is very fond of using this figure, viz., *Vyatiṛeka* and mostly with a touch of humour. While describing the excellence of his hero and heroine he is very often inclined to assert that they superseded the prominent standards of comparison like the moon, lotus, etc., and very often the descriptions are highly humorous. There are plenty of examples of which a few may be noted here. The full moon shines in the sky of the full moon night, and on the head of Lord Śiva shines the half moon. The poet gives a good touch of humour to this idea in III/32 (*dḥk tam vidheh pāṇm ajāta lajjam* etc.) by way of pointing out the beauty of Nala's face which surpasses that of the moon. The swan, which utters the verse, rebukes the hand of the Creator as shameless for making the full moon in the presence of the excellent face of Nala. But it appreciates His other hand as discreet which makes the half moon of Śiva's head. The swan says that the second moon also was going to be made full, but having remembered the excellence of Nala's face the hand of the Creator understood that even a full moon would not match

1 *Vyatiṛeka* has been defined by Maṃmaṭa as—
upamanad yad anyasya vyatiṛekah sa eva sah
 (Kavyaprakāśa, X/159) *anyasya upameyasya vyatiṛeka*
-adḥkyaṃ (Vṛtti thereon)

with the face of Nala ; hence it did not proceed further and left it on the head of Śiva, perhaps thinking that Śiva's matted hair would be able to conceal it.¹ The idea of the next verse (*nilīyate hrī-vidhuraḥ sva-jaitram* etc.) is also humorous. It is believed that the moon merges in the sun on the new moon day (*Amāvāsyā*) and in the ocean when it sets. It is also a natural phenomenon that clouds floating in the sky sometimes veil the moon. Of these phenomena the poet offers a humorous explanation. It is said that hearing of Nala's face surpassing it in beauty, the moon feels ashamed and conceals itself sometimes in the sun, sometimes in the ocean and sometimes behind the clouds. In VII/58 (*asyā mukhenaiva vijitya nitya-* etc.) the halo of the moon is humorously fancied as the rope with which the face of Damayantī has tied up the moon having defeated it in a contest of beauty. The redness of her face caused by saffron is fancied to be due to wrath against the moon, its constant rival (*nitya-spardhin*). In X/121 (*etad-dṛśor amburuhair viśeṣam* etc.) we find a novel comparison between lotuses and the eyes of Damayantī where the supersession of the former by the latter is skilfully suggested in a very humorous style. Black bees, it is well-known, hover about lotuses. The poet fancies the two eye-balls of

1. Cf. *bhava-mūrdhni mahādeva-mastake, tasya jaṣṭilatena jaṭābhis tad-ardha-candrāvaraṇa-sambhavāt ityabhiprāyaḥ* (Siddhāntavāgīśa.)

Damayantī as two black bees, male and female, placed there by the Creator thinking, as it were, "Let one ask this pair of black bees the difference of these eyes from lotus flowers" Evidently the suggestion is that Damayantī's eyes have far surpassed the lotus, otherwise the black bees would not come to them leaving the natural lotus blossom More humorous is the idea contained in XXII/81 (*prsthe 'pī kim tisthatī nātha nātha* etc) where Damayantī tells Nala, "If you want to know whether there is a deer on the back of the moon also as there is one on its lap, ask your own face, because it saw the moon's back in a duel (of beauty)" What Damayantī means to say is simply this The face of Nala is far more beautiful than even the moon She surmises that in a contest of beauty Nala's face defeated the moon when the latter turned its back and ran away as a mark of defeat At that time, therefore, Nala's face must have seen the back of the moon, and, therefore knows well what is there on the other surface of the moon The reader can hardly miss the humour behind the idea All these ideas are very unconventional whereas the refined touch of humour has made them more appealing

Let us pick up a few more examples The following verse humorously describes the feet of Damayantī and her nails (toe nails) by comparing the former with the lotus and the latter with the moon (half moon) Nala says —

*priyā-nakhī-bhūtavato nudedanī
 vyadhād vidhiḥ sādhu-daśatvam indolī/
 etat-pada-c-chadma-sarūga-padma-
 saubhāgya-bhāgyanī katham anyathā syāt//*
 (VII/105)

"It is well that the Creator joyfully made ten moons which have become the nails of my beloved's feet ; otherwise how could the moon have the luck of enjoying the beauty of those crimson lotus blossoms disguised as her feet ?"¹ The moon cannot enjoy the beauty of the lotus for the former shines at night when the latter closes its petals ;² but the poet finds it possible. He fancies the pair of Damayanti's feet as two crimson lotuses (*sarāga-padma*) and the ten nails thereof as the (half) moon assuming ten forms. Thus there has been a unique union of the moon and the lotus. The idea is simply this : Damayanti's feet are comparable with the lotus in point of beauty and her toenails with the (half) moon in point of lustre. The comparison of the foot with the lotus and that of the nail with the half moon³ is a conventional

1. Prof. Handiqui. The second foot may also be translated thus : The Creator assigned a good position (*sādhu daśā*) to the moon.

2. Cf. *sūryāpāye na khalu kamalanī puṣyaṭi svām abhi-
 khyām//* (*Meghadūta*, II/20/D)

3. Nails are compared with the half moon owing to their crescent shape. Cf. the benedictory verse of the *Dhvanyāloka* :—

style of the Sanskrit poets, but the way in which our poet has presented it with a unique touch of humour is absolutely his own.

Equally unconventional is the idea where one of the most conventional comparisons, viz., between the moon and a face, has been used to give an explanation of the stain in the moon. Nala speaks to Damayantī the following words which, the poet himself says, are full of the spirit of humour (*parihāsa-rasotkirā*) :—

*tavānane jātacarīm nipīya
gīlim tad-ākaraṇa-lolupo 'yaṁ/
hātum na jātu sprhayatyavaimi
vidhum mṛgaś tvad-vadana-bhramena//*
(XXII/108)

*svecchā-keśarīṇaś śvaccha-śvac-chāyāśātendavaḥ/
trāyantiūrṇi vo madhu-ripoḥ prapaṇārtic-chido nakhāḥ//*

For the idea of crescent-shaped nail-prints compared with the half moon, see *Naiṣadhīya*, VI/25 (*udartayantyaḥ hṛdaye nipatyā* etc.) where such nail-prints, marked on the breasts of a woman, are humorously fancied to have driven off the eyes of Nala which fell thereon, but immediately turned aside. Cf. *ardha-candra-dāna* (to seize one by the neck and turn out). See also VI/66 (*nārā smaraḥ kṛmī hara-bhūti-gupte* etc.), XI/120 (*kāmaśānta-sāra-sate sutarām adhīti* etc.)

1. Vide the preceding verse.

"Having listened to the ertswile song of thy mouth, yonder deer in the moon, eager to hear it again, wishes never to forsake the moon, mistaking it for thy face, I know."¹ The stain in the moon is traditionally supposed to be a deer for which it (the moon) is known as *Mrgāṅka*. Here Nala gives a humorous explanation as to why the deer (in the form of the moon-stain) remains in the moon. He says, formerly the deer was on the earth where it listened to the song of Damayanti's mouth. Subsequently when it had found the moon in the sky, it mistook the same for Damayanti's face and went there with a hope of hearing the music again. The idea is that, in point of beauty the face of Damayanti appears as the moon, so much so that one is at a loss to differentiate one from the other.

The verse is an example of *Bhrāntimān*, a figure of speech where the similarity between two objects is suggested by expressing the mistake of one for the other.² Daṇḍin gives the following example :—

*śaśītyutprekṣya tanvaṇigī !
tvan-mukhaṇi tvan-mukhāśayā||*

indum apyanudhāvāmī-
*tyesā mohopamā smrtā//*¹

Here also the moon is mistaken for the beautiful face of a lady. The verse of Śrīharsa, though bearing similarity to this verse, is an improvement upon it so far as the sense of humour is concerned. To create humour our poet has inserted the idea of a deer getting attracted to the song of Damayantī. The suggestion is that, Damayantī sings so sweet that even the deer cannot forget it and expects every moment to hear it again. The idea of a deer getting attracted to a musical note is also not a new idea.² Thus we see a combination of two conventional ideas in this verse, nevertheless the entire thing is absolutely a new one.³

1 *Kavyadarsa*, II/25 Dandin gives the name *Mohopama* for *Bhrāntīman*. Cf. *etena navinair angikṛtasya bhrāntī madalamkarasya pracaṁ upamatvena sangraha itī bodhyam/* (Commentary of Premacandra Tarkavagīśa on the verse)

2 Deer are said to be very fond of music, so much so that listening to a musical note they often forget to take notice of even the hunters chasing them. Cf. the picturesque description of a memorable verse of Bhaṭṭi

dattavadhanam madhulehī gītau
prasanta ceṣṭam harinam jighamsuḥ/
*akarnaṇan natsuka hamsa nadat*⁴
lakṣye samadhum na dadhe mṛgāvit//
(*Bhaṭṭikavya*, II/7)

3 For other examples of *Bhrāntīman*, see I/93 (*tad-angam uddiṣṭya sugandhī patukah* etc.), I/95 (*yina dvayā citta-*

The role of word-play in giving a simile a touch of humour should not also be ignored. Thus, the fact that Damayantī knows all the sixty-four arts (*kalā-catuṣṣaṣṭih*) has been humorously accounted for in the following verse by comparing her fame, face and the two nails of her great toes with the full moon and by punning on the word *kalā* :—

*yaśaḥ padānguṣṭha-nakau mukhaṁ ca
bibharti pūrṇendu-catuṣṭayaṁ yā/
kalā-catuṣṣaṣṭir upaitu vāsam
tasyāṁ katham subhruvi nāma nāsyām//*
(VII/106)

“Why should not the sixty-four arts find an abode in this fair-browed girl, who carries about her four full moons in the shape of her fame, face and the two nails of the great toes of her feet?”¹ The verse speaks of Damayantī’s fame, face and the nails of her great toes which are comparable with the full moon in point of whiteness², beauty and lustre respectively. The nails of the great toes only are mentioned because they are bigger

nimajjanocita- etc.) ; IV/64 (*sva-ripu-tikṣṇa-sudarśana-vibhramāt* etc.) ; XI/11 (*vakrendu-sannidhi-nimili-dalāravinda*- etc.) ; XI/60 (*manthā nagaḥ sa bhujaga-prabhu-veṣṭa-ghṛṣṭi*- etc.) ; XI/83 (*etat-tarus taruṇi rājati rāja-jambūḥ* etc.) ; XII/28 (*etad-bhītāri-nārī-giri-viḷa-vigalat*- etc.) ; and so on.

1. Prof. Handiqui.

2. Poets describe fame as white. Cf. *yaśasi dhavalatā varṇyate* (*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VII/19).

and rounder than the other ones and hence bear more resemblance to the moon. Damayanti is thus said to have carried four full moons each of which possesses sixteen *Kalās* or digits.¹ Thus she comes to possess sixty-four *Kalās* or arts altogether. The word *kalā* punningly means (1) a digit of the moon and (2) an art. The digits of the moon have been surmised as the arts known to Damayanti as both are known as *Kalā*.² The idea is very fanciful and the humour is also subtle.

The examples of humorous similes are too numerous to be quoted.³ The instances cited above give a clear idea of Śrīharṣa's sense of humour. There is a saying—*nāstyacaurah kavi-janah*,⁴ which refers to the debt owed even by great poets to their predecessors. Śrīharṣa is no exception in this respect. The basic ideas used by the poet, as noted above, are very common in the vast realm of classical Sanskrit literature ; but the humorous poetic fancy with which the poet presents them makes them absolutely new. His becomes the use

1. The moon is also known as *Kalā-nidhi*.

2. Cf. *kalā tu ṣodaśo bhāgah* and *kalā śilpe kālā-bhede* (*Amara-koṣa*).

3. See another example under *Rhetorical devices*.

4. *nāstyacaurah kavi-jano nāstyacauro vanig-janah/
sa nandati vinā vācyaṁ yo jānāti nigūhitum//*

(Rājaśekhara, *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā*, XI ; Oriental Institute, Baroda, Third Edition, 1934 ; p. 61).

who gives it the best form and here lies the unique achievement on the part of the poet. Rightly did the *Dhvanikāra* say :—

*dr̥ṣṭa-pūrvā api hyarthāḥ
kāvyē rasa-parigrahāt/
sarve navā ivābhūnti
madhu-mūsa iva drumāḥ/*¹

Rhetorical devices

We have seen how skilfully various objects and ideas have been used by Śrīharṣa in his similes. Now we like to point out a few rhetorical devices adopted by the poet. To paint a picture more vividly and to produce a greater rhetorical effect Kālidāsa sometimes uses more *Upamānas* than one and leaps from the concrete to the abstract. The same course is followed by Śrīharṣa as well. The following verse of Kālidāsa is a glorious example :—

*anāghrātāṃ puṣpaṃ kisalayam alūnaṃ kararuhair
anāviddhaṃ ratnaṃ madhu navam anāsvādita-rasam/
akhaṇḍaṃ puṇyānūṃ phalaṃ iva ca tad-rūpaṃ anaghaṃ
na jāne bhoktāraṃ kaṃ iha samupasthāsyati vidhiḥ/*²

1. *Dhivanyāloka*, IV/4.

2. *Śākuntala*, II/10.

"Her flawless beauty is a flower not (yet) smelt (by any one), a tender sprout not plucked with the nails, a gem (as yet) unperforated, fresh honey whose flavour is (yet) untasted, and the reward of collected merit not yet exhausted (by enjoyment) I know not whom Providence designs as her enjoyer"¹ The poet first compares the beauty of Śakuntalā with some concrete objects—flower, sprout, gem and honey, but his heart is not contented thereby, and at last he expresses it by comparing with the reward of collected merit which is purely abstract. Similarly, while painting the picture of Damayanti beautified with ornaments, Śrīharsa says —

vīśesa-tīrthair na jalmu nandin

gunair vajānika rāga bhūmukā/

jagāma bhōgyair na nītir ujjvalair

vibhūsanais tat susamā maharghatām//

(XV/54)

"Her beauty attained a rare excellence by her ornaments, as does the Gangā with its special sites of pilgrimage, as does natural affection for someone by virtue of his merits, as does statecraft by brilliant turns of luck"² Here the first line gives a picture of concrete objects. But that does not satisfy the poet. Perhaps he thinks that the excellence of his heroine exceeded

1 M R. Kale

2. Prof Handiqui

that of any concrete object of the world. Therefore, in the second line he has touched upon an abstract idea—*guṇair ivājānika-rāga-bhūmikā*. But even this does not satisfy him and hence he tries to give a better colour to the picture by a more beautiful abstract idea—*jagāma bhāgyair iva nītir ujvalaiḥ*. This series of comparisons has certainly enhanced the beauty of the picture.¹

Again, while relating the nature of Delusion (*Moha*) the poet uses a series of metaphors in the following verse :—

*jāgratām api nidrā yaḥ
paśyatām api yo 'ndhatā/
śrute satyapi jāḍyaṁ yaḥ
prakāśe 'pi ca yas tamaḥ//*
(XVII/33)

“Delusion is sleep to those who wake ; blindness to those who see ; foolishness in the presence of scriptural knowledge ; and darkness where

1. This verse is an example of *Mālopanā*. (Cf. *mālopanā yad ekasyopamānariḥ bahu dṛśyate*—*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, X/36.) As another example of this figure of speech, see XIV/57 (*utsrjya sāmrajyam ivātha bhikṣām* etc.) where the gods, renouncing the beautiful form of Nala and assuming their respective forms, have been compared with one resorting to begging after renouncing an empire and with one entering the old age from youth. See also X/30 (*anike vidarbhendrapurasya śarike* etc.) where the multitude of kings assembled in the city of Kuṇḍina is compared with the ocean in the palm of sage Agastya and with the entire creation in the stomach of Lord Viṣṇu.

there is light”¹ Here Delusion is, aptly likened to sleep blindness, foolishness and darkness, as it obstructs the access of true knowledge and to obstruct true knowledge is the very nature of sleep, blindness, foolishness and darkness It has been blended with a series of apparent contradictions of sleep with waking, blindness with seeing, foolishness with the presence of scriptural knowledge and darkness with the existence of light

This apparent contradiction, known as *Virodhābhāsa* in the science of poetics, often adds an additional charm to a simile with which it is blended Banabhatta has skilfully adopted this means in his works² This is found in Śrīharsa as well The verse quoted above is a good example The following verse is a bit humorous —

*nṛpaḥ purasthaḥ pratiruddha vartmā
pascāḥ janati kaścana nudyamānaḥ/
jantrastha siddhārtha padabhisekam
labdhvāpyasiddhārtham amanyata svamī*

(X/6)

“A certain king with his way barred by those in front of him, and pushed by those behind, deemed

1 Prof Handiqui

2 Cf *śisīrasyaḥpi ripu jana santāpa karinaḥ, sthīrasyaḥpyavi-
ratam bhramataḥ, nirmalasyaḥpi malinī-kṣtarati vanita mukha-
kamala-dyuteḥ, atidhavalasyapi sarva jana raga karinaḥ sudhasūter
iva jalamidhur udbhavo jaśasaḥ* rāja tārāpīḍo
nāmābhūt/(*Kādambarī*, *Purva-bhāga*, Fourth Edition by Pt Hari-
dasa Siddhāntavāgīśa, Calcutta, Śaka era 1872, p 190)

himself unsuccessful, though he was in the position of "Successful" seeds pressed in a machine."¹ This is from the description of the kings assembled in the *Svayanivara* ceremony of Damayantī. There was a tremendous rush of kings. This verse says that one of them was crushed like mustard seeds (*siddhārtha*) pressed in a machine as his way was blocked by those in front of him whereas he himself was pushed by those behind him. Though he thus attained the position of *siddhārtha* (mustard seeds), nevertheless he believed himself to be *a-siddhārtha* (unsuccessful) as there was no chance for him of getting Damayantī. The verse comprises an apparent contradiction of *siddhārtha* and *a-siddhārtha* which is based on the double meaning of the word *siddhārtha*. If we take the word in the sense of "mustard seed" or "successful" both in the third and in the fourth foot, then *asiddhārtha* will mean just the contradictory, and hence grows the contradiction. If we take it to mean "mustard seed" in the third foot and "successful" in the fourth foot, then *asiddhārtha* will mean "unsuccessful" and the contradiction is solved making the entire meaning clear.² This apparent contradiction has

1. • Prof. Handiqui.

2. An apparent contradiction or *Virodhābhāsa* is so called because here the contradiction (*virodha*) is only apparent (*ābhāsa*) and not real : *virodhasya ābhāsaḥ (āpātataḥ pratītir) iti virodhābhāsaḥ* Mammaṭa (who gives the name *Virodha* for *Virodhābhāsa*) defines it as—*virodhaḥ so 'virodhe 'pi virud-dhatvena yad vacaḥ* | (*Kāvyaprakāśa*, X/166.)

been skilfully blended with the simile drawn from 'mustard seeds pressed in a machine' (*yan-trastha-siddhārtha*) in the third foot of the verse

There are a good number of instances of simile *cum* apparent contradiction in the poem¹ Some of them are plain (as the first one of the two instances cited above) and some are based on word-play (as the second instance cited above) It has to be noted that the apparent contradictions used by Śrīharsa are mostly very simple, whereas those of Bānabhatta are not always so Never do they make the main ideas abstruse and add more charm to the simile with which they are used

In some cases the similes have been interwoven with *double entendre* (*Ślesa*²) without obscuring their natural beauty Some of the verses already cited, particularly as instances of similes drawn from philosophical and other scholastic concepts, involve *double entendre* We have also seen how ingenious play on words creates refined humour As a matter of fact, Śrīharsa has proved himself to be a past master in using this figure of speech viz, *Slesa* There are beautiful instances of simile *cum double entendre* Thus in

1 To note a few, see I/13 (*pratīpa bhupair iva kumtato bhūja* etc), II/73 (*atha bhūma bhujena palita* etc), IV/61 (*asitam eka surasitam apyabhūt* etc), VI/46 (*bhavanadṛśyaḥ pratibimba deha* etc), X/38 (*bhusabhir uccair apī samskṛte jam* etc), and so on

2 Dandin defines *Ślesa* as—

*śliṣṭam iṣṭam anekartham eka rūpanvītam vacaḥ/
(Kavyadarsa, II/310/A B).*

the following verse, speaking of the conclusion of Nala's first speech and the commencement of Damayanti's second speech (in Canto IX), the poet draws a simile from a natural phenomenon :—

*ado 'yam ālapyā śikhīva śārado
babhūva tūṣṇīm ahitāpakāraḥ
athāsya-rāgasya dadhā pade pade
vacāṁsi haṁsīva vidarbhajādade//*
(IX/14)

The rainy season is the time when peacocks cry joyfully,¹ but in the autumn they stop crying. Swans, on the contrary, do not like the rainy season² and enjoy the autumn³ when they, beautiful on

1. Cf. *śuklāpāṅgaīḥ sajalā-nayanaiḥ svāgatikṛtya kekāḥ
pratyudyatāḥ katham api bhavān gantum dśu vyavasyet//*
(Meghadūta, I/23/C-D) ;
*ehyehīti śikhāṇḍināṁ paṣutarāṇi kekābhīr ākranditāḥ
.....meghaḥ samuttiṣṭhate//*
(Mṛcchakaṭīka, V/23) ;
*sthalī navāmbhaḥ-prṣatābhivṛṣṭā mayūra-kekābhīr ivā-
bhīra-vṛṇḍam//*
(Raghuvamśa, VII/6/C-D).
2. Cf. *haṁsair ujjhita-paṅkajair atitarāṇi sodvegā uṣḍvīk-
itāḥ
.....meghaḥ samuttiṣṭhate//*
(Mṛcchakaṭīka, V/23/C-D).
3. Cf. the autumnal description of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* :—
*sītāravinda-pracayeṣu lināḥ
saṁsakta-pheneṣu ca saikateṣu
kundāvadātāḥ kala-haṁsa-mālāḥ
pratīyire śrotra-sukhair ninādaiḥ//*
(II/18).

account of their red beaks come from the *Manasa* lake (where they go at the time of the rainy season¹) with joyful cries. The poet draws a simile from this phenomenon and says. Saying this much the modest one (*sāradaḥ*), who was the destroyer of foes (*ahitāpakāraḥ*) remained silent as does an autumnal (*sāradaḥ*) peacock which oppresses snakes (*ahitāpakāraḥ*), then the daughter of the king of Vīdarbha blushing (*asya ragasya dadha*) as she uttered each word (*pade pade*), gave utterance to these words like a female swan bearing (*dadhā*) on each foot (*pade pade*) the red hue of its beaks (*āśya-ragasya*). Here the expressions *sāradaḥ*, *ahitāpakāraḥ* *asya ragasya*² and *pade pade* carry double meaning. The idea is highly poetical and the *double entendre* has not been as it often happens to be in the hand of many classical poets, an artificial device to obscure the idea, on the contrary it has added a sauce to the sense.

The scene of the bearers bringing Damayanti from prince to prince in her bridal chamber is picturesquely described by our poet. The following verse describes one such picture by drawing a simile from the mythical story of Bhagiratha bringing the Ganges to the earth and of the birth

1 Cf. *jaladhara san aṁ manasam yanti hamsaḥ*

(*Sahityadarpana*, VII/19)

2. *athāśya ragasya* (*atha asya ragasya*) may also be analysed as *atha asya ragasya* and accordingly the third foot may be translated as causing his (Nala's) attachment (to her) by every word she uttered.

of Bhīṣma as the son of the mother Gaṅgā, whereas the epithets are skilfully applied to both the Upamāna (the Ganges) and the Upameya (Damayantī) :—

*bhainīm avāpayata jānya-janas tad-anyan
gaṅgām iva kṣiti-talan raghu-vaṁśa-dīpaḥ/
gāṅgeya-pīta-kuca-kumbha-yugām ca hāra-
cūḍā-samūgama-vaśena vibhūṣitām ca||*
(XI/93)

Bhagīratha, ■ descendant of Raghu, brought the celestial Gaṅgā to the earth for the salvation of the sixty thousand sons of king Sagara (who was the grandfather of the grandfather of Bhagīratha). At the time of her descent from heaven to the earth Lord Śiva bore her on His head. In course of time Gaṅgā gave birth to Bhīṣma who was, therefore, known as Gāṅgeya ('the son of Gaṅgā'). Bhīṣma, therefore, must have sucked the breasts of Gaṅgā, his mother. The poet draws a simile from these legends¹ and says : As the light of the race of Raghu brought to the earth the Ganges the pair of whose jar-like breasts was sucked by Bhīṣma (*gāṅgeya-pīta-kuca-kumbha-yu-*

1. For the story of the Ganges brought by Bhagīratha from heaven and borne by Śiva on his head, see the *Mahābhārata*, *Vana-parvan*, Chs. 108-109 ; the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Ādikāṇḍa*, Cantos 42-44. For the story of the birth of Bhīṣma (who was one of the demi-gods or Vasus, all of whom had to come down to the earth by the curse of Vasiṣṭha), see the *Mahābhārata*, *Ādi-parvan*, Chs. 96-99.

gām) and who was adorned by her contact with the crest of Śiva (*hāra-cūḍā-samāgama-vaśena vibhūṣitām*); similarly the bearers brought Damayantī to another king—her two jar-like breasts were as yellow as gold (*gāṅgeya-pīta-kuca-kumbha-yugām*) and she was adorned with a necklace and a diadem (*hāra-cūḍā-samāgama-vaśena vibhūṣitām*). Here the expressions *gāṅgeya-pīta-kuca-kumbha-yugām* and *hāra-cūḍā-samāgama-vaśena* carry double meaning. Verses like this clearly prove that *double entendre* does not hamper the spontaneity of poetry, nay, it enhances the poetic beauty when handled by a skilful poet. So says Daṇḍin : *śleṣaḥ sarvāsu puṣṇāti prāyo vakroktiṣu śriyam*¹. There are many such examples the beauty of which can be better realised than described.²

Śrīharṣa, it can be definitely said, was well-acquainted with the science of poetics and his skill in handling almost all the figures of speech, including their varieties, has been fully revealed in his poem. The prominent poetic figures based on similarity or comparison have been copiously used by him. The most common of them are

1. *Kāvya-darśa*, II/363/A-B.

2. See I/32 (*yathohyamānaḥ khalu bhoga-bhojinā* etc.); III/4 (*harisaraṇaṁ tanau sannihitaṁ carantam* etc.); X/97 (*sāmoda-puṣpāsuga-vāsitāṅgū* etc.); XVI/119 (*asau mahibhṛd bahudhā tu maṇḍitaḥ* etc.); XIX/8 (*vrajati kumude dr̥ṣṭvā moham* etc.); and so on.

Upamā,¹ *Utprekṣā*, *Rūpaka*, *Atiśayokti*, *Samā-sokti*, *Vyatireka*, *Bhrāntimān*, etc. There are also nice examples of *Nidarśanā*, *Apahnuti*, *Pratīyas-tūpamā*, *Drṣṭānta*, *Pariṇāma*, etc. Sometimes a single verse comprises a number of these figures. In some cases one figure depends on another one and such examples are more appealing.² Double

1. The same figure *Upamā*, says Appaya Dikṣita, assumes many forms, as an actress plays many roles on the stage and delights the heart of the spectator :

upamaikā śailāṣṭī samprāptā citra-bhūmikā-bhedān/
rāñjayati kāvya-rañge nṛtyanti tad-vidān cetaḥ||

(*Citramīmāṃsā*, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Third Edition, Bombay, 1941; p. 6.) The *Naiṣadhacarita* is a glaring example of this remark, and it is more true if the term *upamā* be taken in its general sense.

2. The most prominent examples are the cases of *Param-parita-rūpaka*. Cf. *nija-maṇḥ-paramāṇau hrī-darī-śaya-harī-kṛtam* (V/29); *apāṇga-rathyā-pathikīṇ ca helayā prasadya sandhehi dṛṣaṇī mamopari* (IX/111); *pratyarthi-yauvata-vataṁsa-tamāla-mālonmīlat-tamaḥ-prakara-taskara-śaurya-sūrye* (XI/86); *namra-pratyarthi-prthvi-pati-mukha-kamala-mānatā-bhṛṅga-* (XII/56); *tathotthitarī bhīma-śaṅkh-pratidhvaninī nipīya dūtasya sa vaktra-gaḥvarāt* (XV/10); and so on. In a good number of cases they have been blended with double entendre. Cf. *dayā-samudre sa tadāśaye 'tithi-cakāra kārūnya-raṣāpaga girah* (I/134); *yaśah-pathād āśravatā-padoththāt khalu skhalitvāsta-khalokti-khelāt* (III/84); *himāṁśu-varṣasya karīram eva mām* (IX/12); *bhramāmi te bhaimi sarasvatī-rasa-pravāha-cakreṣu nipatyā katyadaḥ* (IX/51); *ati-bhūyaś-cūḍā-ratno-du-patnī-kara-paricaraṇāmanda-nandan-nakhenduḥ* (XII/18); and so on. For more elaborate examples, see II/49 (*tad idanī viśadanī vaco'mṛtam* etc.); IV/2 (*yad atanu-jvara-bhāk tanute sma sā* etc.); V/14 (*prāg iva prasuvate nṛpa-varṣāḥ* etc.); VII/45 (*seyaṇī mamaitad-virahārti-mūrcchā-* etc.); IX/86 (*dhu-tāpatat-puṣpa-śilimukhāśugaiḥ* etc.); and so forth.

entendre and apparent contradiction play an important part in making them more charming. The semblance is, as we have already seen, sometimes expressed in words (*vācya*) and sometimes suggested (*ryaṅgya*). The similes are thus extremely varied, and indeed it is the variety of imagery and expressions, marked by their aptness and clarity, which gives our poet the stamp of a *Mahākavi* (great poet).

Linguistic features

A few words may be added about the linguistic features of Śrīharṣa's similes. There are four constituents of an *Upamā*,¹ viz., an object of comparison (*Upameya* or *Upamita*), a standard of comparison (*Upamāna*), the point of comparison (*Sāmānya-* or *Sādhāraṇa-dharma*) and a word expressing similarity (*Upamya-vācin*).² A simile where all these four elements are expressly stated is known as *Pūrṇopamā*, and if one or more of these are elided, the simile is known as *Lūptopamā*. All these types are copiously used in this poem. Of the words expressing similarity the most common are *iva* and *yathā*. In

1. Here we have taken the word in its restricted sense in which it has been used by the Sanskrit rhetoricians.

2. For a long list of words expressing similarity, see Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaadarśa*, II/57-65 (*iva-vad-rā-yathā-śabdāḥ* etc.). The list, however, is not exhaustive. Even in Śrīharṣa we come across many new expressions.

■ good number of cases *nibhā* has been used and, as a rule, it has been compounded with the word expressing *Upamāna*. Thus we have *smarārdha-candreṣu-nibhe palāṣe* (on a *Palāṣa* flower appearing as the crescent-shaped arrow of Cupid) in I/84 ; *kaṣa-pāṣāṇa-nibhe nabhas-tale* (on the surface of the sky resembling a touchstone) in II/69 ; *jihvā-nibhayā patākayā* (with the flag resembling its tongue) in II/100 ; *bali-karambha-nibham vidhum* (the moon appearing as curd-rice offered at the time of worship) in IV/64 ; and so on. Similarly the word *ābhā* expresses similarity in *-uda-vindu-vṛndābha-muktā-phala-* (pearls looking like drops of water) in VII/76 ; in *abhi-sārikābhāḥ diśaḥ* (regions of the sky looking like maidens going to meet their lovers) in XXII/33 ; and so on. In a good number of cases the secondary affix *vati* and *kalpap* have been used to convey the idea of similarity. Thus we have *garuḍavad dvija-vāsanayojjhitaḥ* (like Garuḍa giving up the moon under the impression that it was a Brahmin) in IV/71 ; *tṛṇavat taṁ jayāni* (I would conquer him like a straw) in IX/146 ; *grāvonmajjanavad yajña-phale 'pi śruti-satyatā* (the truth of scriptures proclaiming results to be obtained from sacrifices is like that of stones floating on water) in XVII/36 ; *śaśikalpaṁ yaśaḥ* (renown as white as the moon) in V/122 ; *ūrdhvārpita-nyubja-kaṭāha-kalpe vyomni* (in the sky looking like a vessel placed above and turned downwards) in XXII/32 ; and so forth. The word *va* (which is synony-

mous with *iva* but rarely used) occurs, according to some, in *mañi va nīlau tarālau vilesatuḥ* (shone like two wavering sapphires) in IX/85, while others analyse *manīva* as *mañi iva* and explain the grammatical anomaly with the help of the statement of the *Kāśikā* : *īd-ādīnāṃ pragṛhyatre mañivādīnāṃ pratiśedho vaktavyaḥ*.¹ We also come across the most common words like *upamā* (in *vāra-nārī-kuca-saṅcitopamaṃ mā-lūra-phalam* in I/94, in *calat-padāmbhoruha-nū-puropamā kalahansa-maṇḍalī* in I/127, in *aśanikṣatopamaṃ vṛttāntam* in I/139, and so on), *pratimā* (in *na tan-mukhasya pratimā carācare* in I/23), *tulanā* (in *tūlena tasyās tulanā mṛdoḥ* in XIV 54), *sama* (in *tasya rāma-sama-śriyāḥ* in XVII/206), *sanābhi* (in *mañi-sanābhau mukurasya maṇḍale* in XV/50), *anadhara* (in *pīyūṣa-dhārā-nadharābhiḥ rambhādi-saubhāgya-rahāḥ-kathābhiḥ* in III/42), etc. There are also expressions like *pratibhata*, *pratidvandvin*, *ekadhurīṇa*, *bandhu*, *aṅka-kāra*, *svasṛ*, *sakhi*, etc. for implying similarity, though these words bear a different primary meaning. Thus we have *srja tām* (*pratiśrutim*) *śruti-pratibhaṣi-krtyānvitākhyāpadām* (make your promise literally true by making it a rival of the Vedas) in V/135 ; *amṛtāmśu-pratibhate ārāme* (in the garden rivalling the moon) in XVII/218 ; *raṭi-pratidvandvi-tamāsu nū-*

1. Under *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, I/1/11. For the other view, cf. *mañi voṣṭasya lambete priyau vatsatarau mama ityatra trivārthe vo-śabdo vā-śabdo vā bodhyah* (*Siddhānta-kaumudī*, under ap̄or. No. 100, *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, I/1/11.)

nam nāmūṣu nirṇīta-ratīḥ kathañcit (unable to detect Rati in any way among those ladies who rivalled Rati to the utmost degree) in VI/31 ; *svara-madhvarīṇa-tat-kañṭha-nālaika-dhurīṇa-vīṇaḥ priya-śiṣya-vargaḥ* (the disciples whose lutes were equal in sweetness to her throat which was full of the honey of musical notes) in VI/65 ; *anuvraja-bandhu-samāja-bandhubhiḥ puraukasām drṣṭi-prakaraiḥ* (the looks of the citizens bearing resemblance to a group of friends accompanying a departing person) in I/75 ; *ruṣṭādrījā-caraṇa-kunikuma-panka-rāga-saṅkīrṇa-śaṅkara-śaśāṅka-kalāṅka-kāraiḥ nakṣa-padaibḥ* (with nail-marks rivalling the digit of Śiva's moon reddened with the saffron-paint of the feet of sensitive Pārvatī¹) in XI/120 ; *kārttikī-tithi-niśi-thinī-svasā kīrtiḥ* (fame resembling in whiteness the full moon night of the month of Kārttika)

1. The crescent-shaped nail-marks, reddened by the saffron of Damayanti's bosom, have been compared with the digit of Śiva's moon. The reference to Śiva falling at the feet of sensitive Pārvatī is only a poetic elaboration and has not much connection with the main point of comparison. The simile is, therefore, marked, to some extent, by the characteristic of what is known as 'epic simile' or 'Homeric simile'—so called because it was first used by Homer in his Epics. Epic simile is very rare in Sanskrit literature, because Sanskrit poets were very economic in this respect. They would not proceed further from what was necessary for bringing out the main point of comparison of objects. In Bengali literature Michael Madhusudan has used this type of simile profusely and successfully.

in XVIII/21 ; *sugata-saudha-sakhūnām bhūri-śarkara-karambha-balinām* (of the offerings of curd-rice prepared with much sugar resembling Buddhist pagodas) in XXI/25.

There are numerous other types of expression which show how variously our poet can convey the idea of similarity : *maināka-mahūbhṛtaḥ 'sapakṣatām tatāna'* (I/116), *payodhi- 'lakṣmī-muṣi' keli-palvale* (I/117), *bhūṇa-purī- 'parārdhyatām avahat'* (II/87), *tapa-nipīta-saraḥ-sarasīruhaṁ 'hasati' sma* (IV/9), *kiñcid-vivakṣollasad-oṣṭha- 'lakṣmī-jitā' panīdrad-dala-pankajūsyāḥ vayasyāḥ* (VI/101), *udanvatā 'sārdhaṁ spardhitum ahāvati'* (VIII/30), *taḍitval- 'lalitābhinetā' keśavaḥ* (X/51), *kaṭākṣa-rucic-chaṭānām 'vikaṭūyitam anvetu'*, (XI/40), *asaṅkucita-pankaja- 'saḥhya-śikṣā-niṣṇāta'-drṣṭi-* (XI/100), *pārvaṇa-vidhu- 'dvairā' ya-sajjan' yaśaḥ* (XII/65), *sarvāṅgojjvala-śarva-parvata-sita-śrī- 'garva-nirvāsi' yaśaḥ* (XII/65), *sandhyayā sādhu 'sanābhitām babandha'* (XV/21), *sahasrākṣa-tanutra- 'mitratām adhāt'* (XVI/46), *sūna-śayyayā yad-bhuvāḥ bhāla-tilaka- 'pragalbhatū abhāji'* (XVIII/8), *vidhum 'vyaḍambayat'* (XVIII/97), *kula-vadhūm 'avajajñe'* (XXI/27)—these are only a few among many such expressions which are nothing but the different modes of implying comparison of objects.

In many cases the word expressing semblance has been elided and either the *Upamāna* and the *Sādhāraṇa-dharma* or the *Upameya* and the *Upamāna* have been compounded. These are the cases of *Upamāna-* and *Upamita-samāsa* res-

pectively in the language of Sanskrit grammar.¹ In the case of superimposition of the *Upamāna* on the *Upameya* the compound is known as *Rūpaka-samāsa*.² All these types have been profusely used by our poet. Apart from the numerous hackneyed expressions like *pāṇi-paṅkaja* (I/138), *mukha-candra* (II/83), *kamala-komala* (IV/6), *āsyendu* (VI/62), *hṛdayāravinda* (VI/89), *drg-ambhoja* (VII/27), etc., we have uses like *sūnṛta-vāg-brhaspati* (II/63), *naiṣadha-śīla-śītala* (II/94), *phaṇi-bhāṣita-bhāṣya-phak-kikū-viṣamā* (II/95), *romāvali-vetra* (VI/38), *ekāvali-nāka-nadī* (VI/69), *āpad-andhu* (VI/107), *kuca-śaila* (VII/95), *smara-bhilla* (VIII/90), *urvī-tala-śītala-dyuti* (IX/2)³, *kuca-kuṭmala* (IX/85), *udgatvarāṁṛta-karār-dha-parārdhya* (XI/16), and so on. There are also instances of attributive compound (*Bahuvrīhi-samāsa*) with the *Upamāna*. Thus we have '*amogha-megha-vratam*' *loka-nātham* (III/25), '*ardhendulilaiḥ*' *nakhān-*

1. Cf. *upamānāni sāmānya-vacanaiḥ* (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*, II/1/55) and *upamītanī vyāghrādibhiḥ sāmānyāprayoge* (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*, II/1/56).

2. The followers of Pāṇini include it under the *mayūra-ryanisaka* class, aphorised as *mayūra-ryanisakādayaś ca* (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*, II/1/72). Cf. *avihita-lakṣaṇas tatpuruṣo mayūra-ryanisakādiṣu draṣṭavyaḥ* (*Kāśikā* under the above-quoted aphorism).

3. *tam urvī-tala-śītala-dyutim jagāda* (said this to him who was, as it were, the moon on the earth). This is, however, a case of *Lakṣaṇā* (secondary function of word); *urvī-tala-śītala-dyutim* actually means *urvī-tala-śītala-dyuti-tulyam*.

kaiḥ (VI/25), *karabhoru* ! (IX/43), *sārasākṣi* ! (IX/80), *indu-mukhī* ! (XI/58), *kanaka-ketaka-gātra-gātri* ! (XI/59), *dvipādhipati-manda-pade* ! (XI/71), *camatkṛta-cakora-calācalākṣi* ! (XI/73), *kambū-kaṇṭhi* ! (XI/84), *rambhoru* ! (XI/85), *mṛgākṣi* ! (XI/88, 119, etc.), *khañ-jana-mañju-netre* ! (XI/111), *eṇa-locane* ! (XII/15), *aīṇeya-netre* ! (XII/56), *rambhā-taru-pīvaroru* ! (XXII/43), and so forth.

A special feature of Śrīharṣa's style is that he often expresses an ordinary idea in a circumlocutory way and a good number of similes are of this nature. A number of verses already cited exemplify this well. There are also single words implying comparison in a round-about way. Thus he compares Damayantī's waist with the atomic minuteness (*aṇiman*), which Lord Śiva can assume by virtue of His superhuman power, and describes her as *īśāṇimaiśvarya-vivartamadhīyā* (III/64). Other expressions for the same idea are *dvyāṇukodarī* (qualifying Damayantī in IV/3) and *paramāṇu-madhyāḥ* (qualifying the ladies of the harem of Nalā in III/41), whereas an ordinary expression would be *kṛśodarī* (used elsewhere by the poet himself¹) or *madhye kṣāmā* (used by Kālidāsa²). Similarly he uses the word *nīśā-pati-jñāti-mukhī* (XII/14) as an epithet of Damayantī instead of a simple word like *candra-mukhī*, *pūrvaṇa-vidhu-dvairājya-sajjam* (XII/65)

1. See IX/59 (*asevi yas tyakta-dīvā dīvā-nīlam* etc.).

2. See *Meghadūta*, II/22 (*tanvi śyāmā śikharī-daśanā* etc.).

as an epithet of *yaśaḥ* instead of a simpler expression like *pārvaṇa-vidhu-tulyam*, and there are plenty of such examples.

Śrīharṣa is very fond of expressing comparison by using nominal verbs (*Nāma-dhātu*). There are numerous uses of nominal verbs formed with the suffix *kyañ*, besides which those formed with *kyac*, *kvip*, *ñic*, etc. are also found. As examples of nominal verbs implying comparison, we have expressions like *sarojinī divā 'apsarāyitā'* (lotus-plant looked like a nymph in the day-time) in I/115; *kṣīti-maṇḍala-'maṇḍanāyitañ'* *nagarañ kuṇḍinañ yayau* (went to the city of Kuṇḍina which acted as the ornament of the terrestrial globe) in II/64; *pittena dūne rasane sitāpi 'tiktāyate'* (even sugar tastes bitter if the tongue is infected with gall) in III/94; *'prāṇāyitā' nāsi kayāśya gatyā* (how cannot you help becoming his very life?) in III/105; *patrālis tvad-uroja-śaila-nilayā 'tat-parṇa-śālāyate'* (foliage designed on the mount of thy breasts acts as his cottage) in III/128; *kusumam api 'śarāyate'* *śarīre* (even flowers act as arrows on the body) in IV/120; *candrādhikaitan-mukha-candrikāṇāñ vin-du-vrndañ 'radāvali-dvandvati'* (the drops of beam emitted by her face excelling the moon act as the pair of the series of her teeth) in VII/44; *ripu-rājaka-dhūma-ketu-'tārāyamāṇaṇ'* *mañiṇ paśya* (look at the gem which appears as a star acting like a comet to a host of hostile kings) in XI/102; *asya vakṣaḥ 'vajrāyate'* (his bosom acts like thunder) in XI/122; *-'candrāyita'-caraṇa-nakha-śreṇiḥ bhū-*

lokasya bhartā (the protector of the earth the row of whose toe-nails shines like the moon) in XII/56 ; *kāmanī mad-īkṣā-maya-kūma-dhenoh* 'payāyatām' *abhyudayas tvadīyaḥ* (may your prosperity act plentifully as the milk of my auspicious look, the wish-yielding cow) in XIV/73 ; *sa svargīya-mṛgīdṛśām api vaśī-kūrāya 'mārāyate'* (he behaves as Cupid in attracting even the celestial fawn-eyed damsels) in XIV/86 ; '*sa-pallavat*' *vadya manora-thāṅkuraḥ* (let now the sprout of desire grow into leafage) in XV/9 ; *āhuti-dhūma-paddhatiḥ alike* '*lakāyitū*' (the line of smoke arising from the offerings given in fire looked like curls of hair on the forehead) in XVI/41¹ ; *puṣpa-kāṇḍa-jaya-²'dīḍimāyitam* *pāra-dūrīka-vilāsa-sūhasam* (the rashness of adulterous enjoyment which acted as a drum in proclaiming Cupid's victory) in XVIII/20 ; - *śrī-kaṭākṣa-'vikaṭāyita'-kotiḥ tad-vali- sraḥ* (his garland of worship which was as wide as the endless glances

1. The entire verse, which describes the line of smoke arising from the offerings rendered in fire at the time of the marriage ceremony of Nala and Damayanti, runs thus :—

tayā gṛhītāhuti-dhūma-paddhatiḥ
gocā kapole mṛga-nābhi-sobhitām
'jayau dṛṣṭor añjanatām *śrutau śrītā*
tarālā-līlām alike 'lakāyitū'

The line of smoke arising from the offerings (rendered in fire), which was taken up by her, assumed the beauty of musk-paint on her cheeks ; on her eyes it served as collyrium ; on her ears it attained the charm of the leaf of *Tamāla* ; and on her forehead it looked like curls of hair. The

of Lakṣmī) in XXI/41.¹ In all these cases nominal bases (like *apsarāya*, *maṇḍanāya*, etc.) have been formed by adding suffixes to the stems (like *apsaras*, *maṇḍana*, etc.) in the sense of 'an object acting like another' (*tad iva ācarati*). The suffix added is *kyañ*² in all these cases except in *radāvali-dvandvati* and *sa-pallavatu* where it is *kvip*³ (added to the stems *radāvali-dvandva* and *sa-pallava* respectively). These nominal verbs convey the idea of comparison, their agent (*Kartṛ*) being *Upameya* and the basic noun (*apsaras*, *maṇḍana*, etc.) being *Upamāna*; and as the common attribute (*Sādhāraṇa-dharma*) is elided, these are, in terms of the rhetorician, the cases of *Luptopamās*. Our poet has skilfully applied the rules of grammar in forming these new expressions after the model of some conventional ones.

idea contained here is an elaboration of the idea contained in the following verse of Kālidāsa which describes the smoke arising from the fire at the time of the marriage ceremony of Aja and Indumati :—

havliḥ-śamī-pallava-lāja-gandhī
puṇyaḥ kṛśānor udyāya dhūmaḥ
kapola-sarīsarpī-śikāḥ sa tasyā
muhūrta-karṇotpalatān prapede|| (*Raghuvamśa*, VII/26.)

From the fire arose the sacred smoke which was fragrant with clarified butter, leaves of *Śamī* and fried grains (given therein as oblation). With its end coiling over her cheeks it assumed for a moment the semblance of the blue lotus ornaments of her ears.

1. Cf. also *kaṭākṣa-rucic-chaṭānām vikaṭāyitam anvetu* (XI/40).

2. Cf. *kartuḥ kyañ sa-lopaś ca* (*Aṣṭādhyāyī*, III/1/11).

3. Cf. *sarva-prātipadikebhyaḥ kvib vā vaktavyaḥ* (*Vārttika* under *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, III/1/11).

Conclusion

The foregoing discussion is perhaps sufficient to have some idea of the similes used in the *Naisadhacarita*. They are, as we have seen, drawn from various objects and ideas, expressed in different modes, and beautified by many resources of poetic art including lucid language occasionally marked by alliteration. Most of them are very significant and have much novelty in them with regard to the ideas and their expressions. Śrīharsa's wide range of experience (*Vyutpatti*) and original poetic genius (*Pratibha*) have been clearly revealed through the use of these similes.¹

Kavirāja, the author of the *Raghavapāṇḍavīya*, who probably flourished about 800 A.D., claimed only three poets to be well skilled in using *Vakrokti* or poetic figures other than *Ślabhāvokti* (which consists in natural descriptions)²

1 Cf. *pratibhā vyutpattimamś ca kavīḥ kavir ityucyate* (Rājasekhara, *Kavyamamāṃsa*, V, Oriental Institute, Baroda, Third Edition 1934, p. 17)

2 Cf. *bhinnam dvaidhā ślabhavoktiḥ vakroktiś ceti vān-mayam* (Daṇḍin, *Kāvyaḍarśa*, II/363/C-D)

They were—himself, Subandhu and Bāṇabhaṭṭa.¹ Had Kavirāja been posterior to Śrīharṣa, he could never miss his name.

Some critics have charged that Śrīharṣa's figurative uses are exaggerations and they have hampered the natural flow of poetry. The verses like the one where Nala describes Damayantī as an erotic drama (*Manmatha-nāṭikā*) where the marks of such a drama are superimposed on her by ingenious word-play² involve much artificiality. To them we may reply that those exaggerations are the very characteristic features of poetry itself. Poetry does not aim at exact narration of phenomena as they are, but paints them in a different colour of its own. The

1. *subandhur bāṇabhaṭṭas ca kavirāja iti trayah/
vakrokti-mārga-nipuṇās caturtho vidyate na vā//*
(*Rāghavapāṇḍavīya*, I/41.)

2. *na vartase manmatha-nāṭikā kathaṁ
prakāśa-romāvali-sūtra-dhārīṇi/
tavāṅga-hāre rucim eti nāyakaḥ
śikhā-maṇis ca dvitjarād-vidūṣakah//*
(IX/118)

"Dost thou not personify Cupid's drama? Thou dost indeed hold the thread in the shape of the clear line of hairs on thy body; well, the central gem in thy pearlstring does look beautiful, as if it were the hero of the play that takes delight in thy graceful gestures; and, the gem of thy crown, obscuring the moon in brightness, is as the jester of the play, a noble Brāhmaṇa, with a gem on the crest of his head." (Prof. Handiqui.)

For the comment on the verse, see p. 58.

resources of poetic art set the objects of the world of senses to a new frame and make them refreshingly novel and hence appealing to us¹ Accordingly the poet is called the Creator (*Prajapati*) of his own creation (*Kavya samsara*)² Śrīharsa in this respect may have gone a step further from the poets like Valmiki Vyasa and Kalidasa but that is only a different way of creating charm The standard of poetic art varies in each poet and Śrīharsa has certainly attained great success in his own way Rightly did Gadadhara remark —

*anyāḥ kavibhir aksunnam
padarabdham supaddhatim/
samudaya kavīḥ sreyaḥ
śrīman harsaḥ pratisthate*||³

1 Cf Literature always anticipates life It does not copy it but moulds it to its purpose

—Oscar Wilde *The Decay Of Lying*

(*Intentions* 16th Edition London 1947 p 33)

2 Cf *apare kavya samsare kavir ekah prajapatiḥ/
yathasmai rocate vīṣam tathedam parivartate*||

(*Dhyanaloka* III Vṛtti Chowkhamba Banaras

1940 p 498)

3 From Gadadhara's commentary on the *Naiṣadhya* introductory verse 6 (MS of the Oriental Institute Baroda No 1353) *kavīḥ sreyaḥ* occurring in the third foot of the verse is evidently a scribal mistake *sreṣṭhaḥ* may be the correct reading for *sreyaḥ* Professor Jani has however informed me that the correct reading for *kavīḥ sreyaḥ* should be *kavī sreyaḥ* a *Saṣṭhi* compound and an object to *samudaya* His emendation is based on another scribal error in the first foot where the scribe writes *kavibhiḥ rakṣunnam* with a redundant *ī* *sarga* as in the case of *kavīḥ sreyaḥ* in the third foot

ADDENDA

Page 44.

Philosophical ideas :—

Vedānta—

Perhaps no other poetical work in Sanskrit literature than the *Naiṣadhacarita* contains so many references to philosophical doctrines, specially the *Vedānta* doctrines.

In III/3 (*netrāpi vaidarbha-sutā-sakhinām* etc.) and 4 (*haṁsaṁ tanau sannihitaṁ carantaṁ* etc.) similes have been drawn from the doctrine of the realisation of *Brahman* as propounded by the Vedāntists. Damayantī's friends fixing their eyes on the swan have been compared to an ascetic concentrating his mind on the Absolute. Damayantī standing still cautiously to catch the swan has been compared to a sage who comes to a standstill in order to realise the Absolute in him.

In V/8 (*sa vyatītya viyad antar agādham* etc.) Nārada's arrival at the abode of Indra by crossing the vast atmospheric region has been compared to one's attainment of *Brahman* by crossing the ocean of worldly existence (*bhava-sindhu*).

X/63 (*mudhārpitaṁ mūrdhasu ratnam etaiḥ* etc.) is a case of *Dṛṣṭānta* which speaks of the

knowledge of the Soul as self-revealed (*sva-prakāśa*).

In XI/127, (*sānantūn āpya tejaḥ- etc.*) Damayantī, whole-heartedly devoted to Nala, has been compared to the doctrine of the *Upaniṣads* which is solely devoted to the propagation of *Brahman*. Nārāyaṇa finds here a reference to the enumeration of the nine *Dravyas* of the *Vaiśeṣika* system.

The simile used in XIII/35 (*sāptam prayacchati na pakṣa-catuṣṭaye tām etc.*) in connection with the description of Damayantī's bewilderment at the identification of the real Nala has a reference to the validity of the *Advaita* theory.

Mīmāṃsā—

XI/62 (*vedair vacobhir akhilaiḥ kṛta-kīrti-ratne etc.*) draws a simile from the atheism of the *Mīmāṃsā*. The *Mīmāṃsā*, according to some, does not believe in the existence of God, while according to others, the *Mīmāṃsakas* do not reject the existence of God but they only do not believe in His corporeal form. (See Nārāyaṇa's commentary on the verse.) Whatever may be the exact view, this idea has been used by Śrīharṣa when it is said that Damayantī rejected the king of Kuśa-dvīpa in her bridal chamber.

Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika—

Page 50, verse XVII/78 (*tarkāpratiṣṭhayaṁ sām-
yāt etc.*) :

Sat-pratipakṣa has been defined by Viśva-nātha Nyāyapañcānana as—

viruddhayaḥ parāmarśe hetvoḥ sat-pratipakṣatā||¹

When the middle term (*Hetu*) of a syllogism, to which its major term (*Sādhya*) bears the relation of concomitance, is counterbalanced by the middle term of another syllogism having the same relation to an opposite major term, it is a case of *Sat-pratipakṣa* : *tathā ca sva-sādhya-viruddha-sādhyaḥ parāmarśa-vyāpyavattā-parāmarśa-kālina-sādhya-vyāpyavattā-parāmarśa-viśaya ityarthah* ||² An-nambhaṭṭa gives the following example :—

śabdo nityaḥ śrūyaṇatvāc chabdatvavat | *śabdo 'nityaḥ kuryatvād ghaṭavat*||³ Here *śrūyaṇatva* affirming *nityatva* in *Śabda* is counterbalanced by *kuryatva* affirming *anityatva*, which is just the opposite of *nityatva*, in *Śabda*. Hence both the syllogisms are inconclusive.

What the spokesman of heretics wants to say is this : The different schools of philosophy offer different arguments in favour of mutually opposite theories. If their arguments are put in syllogistic forms, it will be found that the respective middle terms are related to mutually opposite major terms. All the arguments are, therefore, invalid.

1. *Bhāṣāpariccheda, Anumāna-khaṇḍa*, 77.

2. *Muktāvalī on Bhāṣāpariccheda, Anumāna-khaṇḍa*, 77.

3. *Tarkasamīcra, Anumāna-khaṇḍa* ; Third Edition, Chow-khamba, Banaras, 1960 ; p. 23.

This refutation, however, is not tenable. A philosopher does not say anything with the ultimate truth in his hand, but seeks to realise the truth. To say that the philosophical tenets are untenable owing to their inconclusiveness is to strike at the very root of philosophical investigations. Placed under one hierarchy, all the tenets are valid in their respective ways : *mukhyoddeśye sarveṣāṃ eva samanvayāt prāmāṇyam ityūstika-vādaḥ*¹. Thus from one standpoint the *Vedānta* says that there is only one Soul, whereas the *Nyāya* admits plurality of the Soul from another standpoint. Creation, Bondage, Liberation, etc. are explained by the *Vedānta* in one way, by the *Sāṃkhya* in a different way. God is admitted by the *Nyāya*, but not by the *Sāṃkhya*. For this they cannot be subject to the fallacy of *Sat-pratipakṣa*. *Sat-pratipakṣa* actually happens to be a fallacy when a counter-argument is offered from the same system of thought. Thus in the example offered by Annambhaṭṭa, both the arguments, viz., *śrāvaṇatvāt nityaḥ* and *kāryatvāt anityaḥ* are from the *Naiyāyika's* standpoint and hence they are subject to the fallacy of *Sat-pratipakṣa*.

Other references to the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* systems :

The metaphor in VII/89 (*romāvalī-daṇḍa-nitamba-cakre* etc.) has a clear reference to the theory of causation. The verse is a description

1. Commentary of Haridāsa Siddhāntavāgiśa on the verse under discussion.

of Damayanti's youthfulness. The pet examples of accessory materials for making a pitcher, viz., a rod, a wheel, a piece of thread and water, have been mentioned here.

XVII/74 (*muktaye yaḥ śilātvāya* etc.) refers to Gotama's conception of Salvation where the spokesman of heretics compares *Mukti* to the condition of a stone, because at this stage the Soul has got no sense of pleasure, pain, etc. (See Nārāyaṇa's commentary on the verse.)

XVII/144 (*sā vinītatamā bhaimī* etc.) draws a simile from right cognition (*Pramiti*) and false cognition (*Vibhrama*) propounded by the *Naiyāyikas* when Indra tells Kali that he (Kali) cannot oppress Damayanti as errors cannot invalidate right knowledge.

VII/75 (*etat-kuca-spardhitayā ghaṭasya* etc.), by way of comparing Damayanti's breast to a jar, refers to *Ghaṭa* (jar) used as a pet example in philosophical works, e.g., *śabdo 'nityaḥ kārya-tvād ghaṭavat*.

Sāṃkhya-Yoga—

The simile in the expression *iśāṇimaiśvarya-vivarta-madhye* (III/64/A), by which the poet compares Damayanti's waist to the atomic minuteness assumed by Śiva, refers to Śiva's *Yogic* power.

In XXII/23 (*kiṃ yoginīyaṃ rajanī ratiśam*, etc.) the night is fancied to be a *Yoginī*

(a woman adept in mystic performances)—giving life to Cupid, making the lotus faint and making the conch (in the form of the moon) detached, yet sticking to the sky.

In the next verse also (*prābodha-kāle 'hani bādhitāni* etc.) the night is said to be a *Yoginī* who declares the world to be false. The reference here is, of course, to the Buddhist (*Mādhyamika*) doctrine of Nihilism (*Śūnya-vāda*) according to which the worldly existence is illusory. (Cf. N.C., X/88 ; fn. 3, p. 55.)

Page 55, fn. 3.

Verse X/88 (*yā soma-siddhānta-mayānaneva* etc.) :

The verse is one of those which describe Sarasvatī who is employed by king Bhīma to introduce the kings to Damayantī in her bridal chamber. The verses contain many metaphorical expressions referring to different branches of philosophy and their tenets as well as other *śāstras*. Thus there are references to the *Vedas*, the *Vedāṅgas*, prosody, grammar, astronomy, *Nyāya*, *Mīmāṃsā*, *Vedānta*, *Purāṇa*, etc. But the literary worth of these verses is not so commendable. They are more scholastic than charming.

Page 67, fn. 3.

For a detailed account of the division of the earth into various regions, see the *Bhūga-vata*, V.

Page 76, fn. 2.

Verse XXII/146 (*sapīteḥ samprīter ajani* etc.) : The nectar of the moon is fancied to be wine. In the last foot of the verse we have—*sudhām abhyud-dhartum*. The moon is known as *Sudhānidhi* (reservoir of ambrosia) perhaps because of its extreme deliciousness. By that virtue it enlivens people just as ambrosia, it is supposed, enlivens gods when they drink it.

The sun and the moon, it is said, regulate the worldly existence. The sun sucks water and saves the earth from inundation. The moon, it is believed, makes the herbs and plants grow up by virtue of its animating power. To animate, according to Hindu mythology, is the nature of ambrosia (*Amṛta* or *Sudhā*), and hence the moon comes to be known as the reservoir of ambrosia.

Page 87, fn. 2.

Verse XIV/36 (*mukhābjam āvartana-lola-nālam* etc.) : It should not be understood that Damayantī was not averse to the gods and that she turned away her face only out of bashfulness. Averse she certainly was, but the point is that, the simile suggests something in addition. Damayantī did not express her aversion to the gods in a rude way, and even at the time of giving expression to her ill feelings she did not lose her natural excellence.

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abhijñānaśakuntala* of Kālidāsa with English translation by the late M. R. Kale, Eighth Edition, Bombay, 1957.
- A Critical Study Of Śrīharṣa's Naiṣadhīyacaritam* by Prof. Arunoday Natvarlal Jani, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1957.
- Amara-koṣa*, Sixth Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1944.
- An Advanced History Of India* by Prof. R. C. Majumdar, Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri and Prof. Kalikinkar Datta, Second Edition, London, 1961.
- Bhāṣāpariccheda* of Viśvanātha. Calcutta, 1947.
- Bhaṭṭikāvya* of Bhaṭṭi, Part I, Calcutta, 1878.
- Brahma-purāṇa*, Ānandāśrama Press, Poona, 1895.
- Citramīmāṃsā* of Appaya Dikṣita, Third Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1941.
- Dharmasūtras* of Gautama, Ānandāśrama Press, Poona, 1910.

Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the commentaries *Locana* of Abhinavagupta and *Bālapriyā* of Pt Rāmasāraka, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1940

Kādambarī of Bānabhatta, *Pūrva-bhāga*, Fourth Edition by Pt Haridāsa Siddhantavāgiśa, Calcutta, 1872 Śaka era

Kāśikā of Jayaditya-Vāmana (on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*¹ of Panini), Third Edition, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1952

Kāvyādarsa of Dandin with the commentary *Mālinyaproñchanī* of Pt Premacandra Tarkavāgiśa, Calcutta, 1956

Kāvyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1928

Kāvyālaṃkāra-sūtra-ṛtti of Vāmana, Second Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1895

Kāvyaṃimāmsā of Rājaśekhara, Third Edition, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1934

Kāvyaaprakāśa of Mammata, Sixth Edition, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1950

Khandanakhandakhūḍya of Śrīharsa, Banaras, 2018 Vikrama era

1 The *Vārtikas* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* conform to those read in the *Siddhāntakaumudī*

- Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi, Fourteenth Edition,
Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1954.
- Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa, Fourteenth Edition,
Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1955.
- Literary Essays Of Ezra Pound* edited by T. S.
Eliot, London, 1954.
- Mahābhārata*, Vol. I, First Edition, Gītā Press,
Gorakhpur, 2013 Vikrama era.
- Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (*Navāhnikā*), Chowkhamba,
Banaras, 1954.
- Manu-smṛti*, Tenth Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press,
Bombay, 1946.
- Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa with English translation
by the late M. R. Kale, Sixth Edition, Bombay,
1960.
- Mṛcchakaṭīka* of Śūdraka, Part I, edited by
V. G. Paranjpe, Poona, 1937.
- Mudrārākṣasa* of Viśākhadatta, Second Edition by
R. R. Deshpande, Surat, 1948.
- Naiṣadhacarita*¹ of Śrīharṣa with the commen-
tary *Gadādhari* of Gadādhara, MS of the
Oriental Institute, Baroda, No. 1353.

1. The numbers of the verses of the *Naiṣadhacarita* refer to those of Calcutta and Nakipur Editions as noted in this bibliography. There has been, however, a free choice of readings.

Naiṣadhacarita of Śrīhaṛṣa with the commentary *Jayantī* of Pt. Haridāsa Siddhāntavāgīśa, Vol. I (Cantos I to XI), Second Edition, Calcutta, 1871 Śaka era.

Do, Vol. II (Cantos XII to XXII), Nakipur, 1849 Śaka era.

Naiṣadhacarita Of Śrīhaṛṣa by Prof. Krishna Kanta Handiqui, Second Edition, Deccan College, Poona, 1956.

Naiṣadha-dīpikā commentary of Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita, MS of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, No. 16 of 1874-75.

Naiṣadhīyacarita of Śrīhaṛṣa with the commentary *Naiṣadhīya-prakāśa* of Nārāyaṇa, Ninth Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1952.

Padma-purāṇa, I (*Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*), First Edition, Calcutta, 1957.

Prabandhakōśa of Jaina Rājaśekhara Sūri, First Edition, Santiniketana, 1935.

Rūghavapūṇḍarīya of Kavirāja, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1897.

Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa, Eleventh Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1948.

Rāmāyaṇa, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1957.

Rasagaṅgādhara of 'Jaṅannātha, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1955.

Rgveda-saṁhitā, Third Edition, Pārādī, 1957.

Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha, Fifth Edition by Pt. Haridāsa Siddhāntavāgīśa, Calcutta, 1875 Śaka era.

Sāṁkhya-kārikā of Iśvarakṛṣṇa, Banaras, 1905.

Sanskrit Grammar of W. D. Whitney, Second Edition, London, 1923.

Siddhāntakaumudī, Vol. I, Third Edition, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Banaras, 1958.

Do, Vol. III, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Banaras, 1950.

Śiśupālavadha of Māgha, Twelfth Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1957.

Skanda-purāṇa, IV (*Kāśī-khaṇḍa*), Venkateśvara Press, Bombay, 1965 Vikrama era.

Śrīmad-bhāgavata, Seventh Edition, Gita Press, Gorakhpur, 2018 Vikrama era.

Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, Calcutta, 1871.

Tarkasaṁgraha of Annambhaṭṭa, Third Edition, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1960.

The Decay Of Lying by Oscar Wilde : *Intentions*, Sixteenth Edition, London, 1947.

The Naisadhacarita In Its Bearing On The Alaṅkāra-code by Prof. Sivaprasada Bhattacharya : Prof. P. K. Gode Commemoration Volume, Poona, 1960, Part III.

The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Revised and Enlarged Edition by Prof. V. S. Apte, Part II, Poona, 1958.

सम्पूर्ण उदासी सदाके लिये तिरोहित हो जाती है।

भूमण्डलमें धर्म और नीतिकी पताका तभी लहरायेगी जब स्वस्थचित एवं आनन्दित होकर लोग करुणा, मैत्री, मुदिताकी मस्तीमें धर्म और नीतिको अपने सदाचरणद्वारा विस्तारित करेंगे। इसीसे 'बसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्' की भावनाका विस्तार होगा। इसके साथ ही पापमार्गमें प्रवृत्त अनैतिक आचरण करनेवाले अधार्मिक व्यक्तियोंके प्रति 'उपेक्षा' की भावना अर्थात् वह अपने पापाचारोंका स्वयं फल भोगेगा। ऐसी भावना रखनी चाहिये। उसके प्रति द्वेष या घृणा करके अपनेको दूषित नहीं बनाना चाहिये। ऐसे भावसे द्वेष तथा अमर्याद चित्तके मलकी निवृत्ति हो जाती है। उत्तम नीति तो यही है कि सबके कल्याणकी भावना रखी जाय।

ऐसी स्थितिमें साधकके जीवनमें सत्य एवं प्रेमरूपी परमात्माका अवतरण होता है। पद-प्रतिष्ठाके स्थानपर 'परमात्मा', धनके स्थानपर 'ध्यान' तथा 'देह' के स्थानपर 'देही' की नित्यताका अनुभव होने लगता है। परिणामतः धर्म और नीतिके मणि-काष्ठन-संयोगसे साधकका मन एकाग्र हो जाता है, जिससे परमात्मोपलब्धि स्वतः ही हो जाती है एवं जीवनकी समस्याका समाधान हो जाता है, अशान्तिके स्थानपर अविरल शान्ति तथा अभयकी प्राप्ति हो जाती है। यही कारण है कि भक्त इस स्थितिको प्राप्तकर कभी विभक्त नहीं होता है तथा वह 'धरमु न दूसर सत्य समान' को अपने जीवनका पर्याय बना लेता है।

मानवके जीवनमें आज घोर तनावकी स्थिति व्याप्त है, 'शान्ति', अभय और आनन्द शास्त्रोंके शब्दमात्र रह

गये हैं। जिस प्रकार आगसे खौलते हुए जलमें झाँकना असम्भव है, उसी प्रकार चित्तपर विचार-तरंगोंकी उष्णतासे अन्तस्में छिपे सत्य, प्रेम, करुणा, मैत्री, मुदिता, सद्भाव, शान्ति और अभयको मानव नहीं देख पाता। परिणामतः समाजका कल्याण तथा विश्वबन्धुत्वकी भावना असम्भव नहीं तो कठिन अवश्य लगने लगती है। आज समाजमें नैतिक होनेका भ्रम ही व्याप्त है जिससे 'नीति' की प्रतिष्ठा नहीं हो पा रही है। 'नीति' तो आनन्दकी स्फुरण है जो 'धर्म' के सुरम्य वातावरणमें ही पल्लवित-पुष्पित होती है। आनन्द जब अन्तस्से प्रवाहित होने लगता है, तब वही बाह्य जगत्में 'सदाचरण' बन जाता है। इसका तात्पर्य यह है कि जब 'आनन्द' की सुगन्ध बाहर फैल जाती है, तब व्यक्तिके जीवनमें शान्ति, सद्भाव तथा कल्याणकी प्रतिष्ठा हो जाती है।

तात्त्विक विवेचन यह है कि मानवके जीवनमें 'महानता' नहीं 'मानवता' का अवतरण होना आवश्यक है। व्यक्तिका जीवन 'लम्बा' नहीं, बल्कि बड़ा होना चाहिये। धर्मके परिप्रेक्ष्यमें नीतिकी प्रतिष्ठासे ही मानवमें अविरल शान्ति तथा अभयकी स्थिति हो सकती है। परिणामतः प्रेम और सत्यका आश्रय लेकर व्यक्ति 'आत्मनः प्रतिकूलानि परेषां न ममाचरेत्' के आचरणको जीवनमें व्यवहृत कर 'सर्वजनसुखाय' तथा 'सर्वजनहिताय' को अपने जीवनका उद्देश्य मान लेता है जिसकी अन्तिम परिणति करुणा, मैत्री, मुदिता, मानव-कल्याण तथा विश्वबन्धुत्वकी भावनामें होती है।

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abhijñānaśakuntala* of Kālidāsa with English translation by the late M. R. Kale, Eighth Edition, Bombay, 1957.
- A Critical Study Of Śrīharṣa's Naiṣadhīyacaritam* by Prof. Arunoday Natvarlal Jani, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1957.
- Amara-koṣa*, Sixth Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1944.
- An Advanced History Of India* by Prof. R. C. Majumdar, Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri and Prof. Kalikinkar Datta, Second Edition, London, 1961.
- Bhāṣāpariccheda* of Viśvanātha. Calcutta, 1947.
- Bhaṭṭikāvya* of Bhaṭṭi, Part I, Calcutta, 1878.
- Brahma-purāṇa*, Ānandāśrama Press, Poona, 1895.
- Citramīmāṃsā* of Appaya Dikṣita, Third Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1941.
- Dharmasūtras* of Gautama, Ānandāśrama Press, Poona, 1910.

Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana with the commentaries *Locana* of Abhinavagupta and *Bālapriyā* of Pt Rāmasāraka, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1940

Kādambarī of Bānabhatta, *Pūrva-bhāga*, Fourth Edition by Pt Haridāsa Siddhantavāgiśa, Calcutta, 1872 Śaka era

Kāśikā of Jayaditya-Vāmana (on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*¹ of Panini), Third Edition, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1952

Kāvyādarsa of Dandin with the commentary *Mālinyaproñchanī* of Pt Premacandra Tarkavāgiśa, Calcutta, 1956

Kāvyālaṃkāra of Bhāmaha, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1928

Kāvyālaṃkāra-sūtra-ṛtti of Vāmana, Second Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1895

Kāvyaṃimāmsā of Rājaśekhara, Third Edition, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1934

Kāvya-prakāśa of Mammata, Sixth Edition, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1950

Khandanakhandakhūḍya of Śrīharsa, Banaras, 2018 Vikrama era

1 The *Vārtikas* of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* conform to those read in the *Siddhāntakaumudī*

- Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi, Fourteenth Edition,
Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1954.
- Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa, Fourteenth Edition,
Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1955.
- Literary Essays Of Ezra Pound* edited by T. S.
Eliot, London, 1954.
- Mahābhārata*, Vol. I, First Edition, Gītā Press,
Gorakhpur, 2013 Vikrama era.
- Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (*Navāhnikā*), Chowkhamba,
Banaras, 1954.
- Manu-smṛti*, Tenth Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press,
Bombay, 1946.
- Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa with English translation
by the late M. R. Kale, Sixth Edition, Bombay,
1960.
- Mṛcchakaṭīka* of Śūdraka, Part I, edited by
V. G. Paranjpe, Poona, 1937.
- Mudrārākṣasa* of Viśākhadatta, Second Edition by
R. R. Deshpande, Surat, 1948.
- Naiṣadhacarita*¹ of Śrīharṣa with the commen-
tary *Gadādhari* of Gadādhara, MS of the
Oriental Institute, Baroda, No. 1353.

1. The numbers of the verses of the *Naiṣadhacarita* refer to those of Calcutta and Nakipur Editions as noted in this bibliography. There has been, however, a free choice of readings.

Naiṣadhacarita of Śrīharṣa with the commentary *Jayantī* of Pt. Haridāsa Siddhāntavāgīśa, Vol. I (Cantos I to XI), Second Edition, Calcutta, 1871 Śaka era.

Do, Vol. II (Cantos XII to XXII), Nakipur, 1849 Śaka era.

Naiṣadhacarita Of Śrīharṣa by Prof. Krishna Kanta Handiqui, Second Edition, Deccan College, Poona, 1956.

Naiṣadha-dīpikā commentary of Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita, MS of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, No. 16 of 1874-75.

Naiṣadhīyacarita of Śrīharṣa with the commentary *Naiṣadhīya-prakāśa* of Nārāyaṇa, Ninth Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1952.

Padma-purāṇa, I (*Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*), First Edition, Calcutta, 1957.

Prabandhakōśa of Jaina Rājaśekhara Sūri, First Edition, Santiniketan, 1935.

Rūghavapūṇḍavīya of Kavirāja, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1897.

Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa, Eleventh Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1948.

Rāmāyaṇa, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1957.

Rasagaṅgādhara of 'Jaṅannātha, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1955.

Ṛgveda-saṁhitā, Third Edition, Pārādī, 1957.

Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha, Fifth Edition by Pt. Haridāsa Siddhāntavāgīśa, Calcutta, 1875 Śaka era.

Sāṁkhya-kārikā of Iśvarakṛṣṇa, Banaras, 1905.

Sanskrit Grammar of W. D. Whitney, Second Edition, London, 1923.

Siddhāntakaumudī, Vol. I, Third Edition, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Banaras, 1958.

Do, Vol. III, Motilal Banarsi Dass, Banaras, 1950.

Śiśupālavadha of Māgha, Twelfth Edition, Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay, 1957.

Skanda-purāṇa, IV (*Kāśī-khaṇḍa*), Venkateśvara Press, Bombay, 1965 Vikrama era.

Śrīmad-bhāgavata, Seventh Edition, Gita Press, Gorakhpur, 2018 Vikrama era.

Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, Calcutta, 1871.

Tarkasaṁgraha of Annambhaṭṭa, Third Edition, Chowkhamba, Banaras, 1960.

The Decay Of Lying by Oscar Wilde : *Intentions*, Sixteenth Edition, London, 1947.

The Naisadhacarita In Its Bearing On The Alan-kāra-code by Prof. Sivaprasada Bhattacharya : Prof. P. K. Gode Commemoration Volume, Poona, 1960, Part III.

The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Revised and Enlarged Edition by Prof. V. S. Apte, Part II, Poona, 1958.

सम्पूर्ण उदासी सदाके लिये तिरोहित हो जाती है।

भूमण्डलमें धर्म और नीतिकी पताका तभी लहरायेगी जब स्वस्थचित एवं आनन्दित होकर लोग करुणा, मैत्री, मुदिताकी मस्तीमें धर्म और नीतिको अपने सदाचरणद्वारा विस्तारित करेंगे। इसीसे 'बसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्' की भावनाका विस्तार होगा। इसके साथ ही पापमार्गमें प्रवृत्त अनैतिक आचरण करनेवाले अधार्मिक व्यक्तियोंके प्रति 'उपेक्षा' की भावना अर्थात् वह अपने पापाचारोंका स्वयं फल भोगेगा। ऐसी भावना रखनी चाहिये। उसके प्रति द्वेष या घृणा करके अपनेको दूषित नहीं बनाना चाहिये। ऐसे भावसे द्वेष तथा अमर्यरूप चित्तके मलकी निवृत्ति हो जाती है। उत्तम नीति तो यही है कि सबके कल्याणकी भावना रखी जाय।

ऐसी स्थितिमें साधकके जीवनमें सत्य एवं प्रेमरूपी परमात्माका अवतरण होता है। पद-प्रतिष्ठाके स्थानपर 'परमात्मा', धनके स्थानपर 'ध्यान' तथा 'देह' के स्थानपर 'देही' की नित्यताका अनुभव होने लगता है। परिणामतः धर्म और नीतिके मणि-काञ्चन-संयोगसे साधकका मन एकाग्र हो जाता है, जिससे परमात्मोपलब्धि स्वतः ही हो जाती है एवं जीवनकी समस्याका समाधान हो जाता है, अशान्तिके स्थानपर अविरल शान्ति तथा अभयकी प्राप्ति हो जाती है। यही कारण है कि भक्त इस स्थितिको प्राप्तकर कभी विभक्त नहीं होता है तथा वह 'धामु न दूसर सत्य समाना' को अपने जीवनका पर्याय बना लेता है।

मानवके जीवनमें आज घोर तनावकी स्थिति व्याप्त है, 'शान्ति', अभय और आनन्द शास्त्रोंके शब्दमात्र रह

गये हैं। जिस प्रकार आगसे खोलते हुए जलमें झाँकना असम्भव है, उसी प्रकार चित्तपर विचार-तरंगोंकी उष्णतासे अन्तस्में छिपे सत्य, प्रेम, करुणा, मैत्री, मुदिता, सद्भाव, शान्ति और अभयको मानव नहीं देख पाता। परिणामतः समाजका कल्याण तथा विश्वबन्धुत्वकी भावना असम्भव नहीं तो कठिन अवश्य लगने लगती है। आज समाजमें नैतिक होनेका भ्रम ही व्याप्त है जिससे 'नीति' की प्रतिष्ठा नहीं हो पा रही है। 'नीति' तो आनन्दकी स्फुरण है जो 'धर्म' के सुरम्य वातावरणमें ही पल्लवित-पुष्पित होती है। आनन्द जब अन्तस्से प्रवाहित होने लगता है, तब वही बाह्य जगत्में 'सदाचरण' बन जाता है। इसका तात्पर्य यह है कि जब 'आनन्द' की सुगन्ध बाहर फैल जाती है, तब व्यक्तिके जीवनमें शान्ति, सद्भाव तथा कल्याणकी प्रतिष्ठा हो जाती है।

तात्त्विक विवेचन यह है कि मानवके जीवनमें 'महानता' नहीं 'मानवता' का अवतरण होना आवश्यक है। व्यक्तिका जीवन 'लम्बा' नहीं, बल्कि बड़ा होना चाहिये। धर्मके परिप्रेक्ष्यमें नीतिकी प्रतिष्ठासे ही मानवमें अविरल शान्ति तथा अभयकी स्थिति हो सकती है। परिणामतः प्रेम और सत्यका आश्रय लेकर व्यक्ति 'आत्मनः प्रतिकूलानि परेषां न ममाघरेत्' के आचरणको जीवनमें व्यवहृत कर 'सर्वजनसुखाय' तथा 'सर्वजनहिताय' को अपने जीवनका उद्देश्य मान लेता है जिसकी अन्तिम परिणति करुणा, मैत्री, मुदिता, मानव-कल्याण तथा विश्वबन्धुत्वकी भावनामें होती है।